

The Influence of Civil Remedies and Proceeds of Crime Grant Programs on Canadian
Streetscape Camera Surveillance Systems: Lessons from Six Cities in Ontario.

by

Denise Mahon
B.A., University of Victoria, 2010

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Sociology

© Denise Mahon, 2014
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

The Influence of Civil Remedies and Proceeds of Crime Grant Programs on Canadian Streetscape Camera Surveillance Systems: Lessons from Six Cities in Ontario.

by

Denise Mahon
B.A., University of Victoria, 2010

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Sean Hier (Department of Sociology)
Supervisor

Dr. André Smith (Department of Sociology)
Departmental Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Sean Hier (Department of Sociology)

Supervisor

Dr. André Smith (Department of Sociology)

Departmental Member

This thesis explores the influences of provincial grant programs on Canadian streetscape camera systems. Using qualitative interviews (N=32) and document analysis, the study explores the policymaking processes and outcomes of six Ontario cities that have engaged with the Civil Remedies and Proceeds of Crime grants. Grant programs have not only provided the financial support to facilitate the establishment or expansion of camera systems, but they have also encouraged particular patterns of implementation, design and operation of Canadian streetscape systems through the processes and conditions of the grant program, as well as through the encouragement of regional networking, policy learning and policy diffusion via policy tourism. While the Civil Remedies and Proceeds of Crime grants have influenced some similarities in streetscape camera systems, variation exists, particularly concerning privacy policies, due to idiosyncratic interpretation and adoption of diffused policies and an ambiguous and unclear privacy protection framework.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Section 1: Introduction, Analytic Framework and Methods.....	1
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Approaches to Understanding Streetscape Camera Systems.....	13
Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology.....	30
Section 2: Findings, Analysis and Discussion.....	40
Chapter 4: Quinte West.....	43
Chapter 5: Successful Grant-funded Cities: Cornwall, Belleville and Cobourg.....	55
- Cornwall.....	56
- Belleville.....	69
- Cobourg.....	81
Chapter 6: Failed Grant Applicants: Peterborough and Orillia.....	89
- Peterborough.....	89
- Orillia.....	100
Chapter 7: Discussion and Concluding Remarks.....	115
Bibliography.....	137
Appendix 1 Thematic Summary.....	145
Appendix 2 Participant Consent Form.....	147
Appendix 3 Interview Script – For City Representatives.....	150
Appendix 4 Interview Script – For Grant Program Representatives.....	153

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Sean Hier, for his supervision, advice and guidance throughout my graduate degree. Dr. Hier has provided me with many invaluable opportunities and experiences as a young researcher, and I attribute my own intellectual development in large part to the instruction and assistance he has given to me over the years. I would also like to thank Dr. André Smith for his contributions to this thesis, as well as my education as a graduate student. Dr. Smith's expertise with qualitative methodology has helped me to locate my own placement within the methodological field and his editorial assistance has helped make me a better writer.

The financial support I received to complete this study was instrumental. I am grateful for the support received through the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada (SSHRC), not only for my own graduate funding through the Joseph-Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate Scholarship, but also through the Institutionalization of Streetscape Camera Funding in Canada project. I would also like to thank the Sara Spencer Foundation for their generous contribution to my research.

I especially thank the participants of this study. Without their participation and willingness to share their experiences, this study would not have been possible.

Finally, I must express my gratitude toward my friends, family, and partner Geoff for their patience, understanding, and support throughout my degree, and this thesis in particular. I dedicate this thesis to my loved ones who have always been there for me.

Section 1

Introduction, Analytic Framework and Methods

Chapter 1

Introduction

Since 1981, at least 30 Canadian cities have established streetscape camera systems¹ (Hier and Walby 2011: 846). Streetscape camera systems are most often implemented to address crime, social disorder and the fear of crime. Systems have been established mostly through community partnerships composed of members of police departments, municipal governments and business organizations. Due to the absence of centrally committed government funds, streetscape systems have been heavily reliant on community partnerships to generate start up capital and promotional efforts. In the last few years, however, Canadian cities have started to establish camera systems using money from two provincial grant programs which award funds for crime prevention initiatives.

This thesis investigates the influences that provincial grant programs exercise on Canadian streetscape camera systems. I focus on two grant programs in the province of Ontario: the Ministry of the Attorney General's Civil Remedies Grant Program (CR) and the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Service's Proceeds of Crime – Front-line Policing Grant (POC). Both funding programs have facilitated the establishment or

¹ Streetscapes refer to areas that include entire streets, sidewalks, buildings (commercial, residential, public properties), and transportation structures (e.g. bus stops, bus shelters); this is in distinction to camera systems that focus specifically on private property, (e.g. residences), or semi-public property (e.g. airports, utilities).

expansion of streetscape camera programs in Ontario². These grant programs have not only provided the financial support to make camera systems possible, but they have also encouraged particular patterns of implementation, design and operation of Canadian streetscape systems through the processes and conditions of the grant program, as well as through the encouragement of networking and policy learning between regional cities.

The Civil Remedies and Proceeds of Crime Grants

The Civil Remedies and Proceeds of Crime grants have been awarding funds to police services in Ontario for over four years. The CR program has funded at least ten camera programs, sometimes awarding grants to cities more than once (for example, providing additional money for expansions to an existing camera system). It is unknown how many camera programs the POC has funded³. The funds supporting both programs come from forfeited assets. Asset forfeiture refers to the seizure of the economic assets produced through criminal activities. Proceeds from unlawful activities (e.g. profits from selling drugs) or property (e.g. real estate) assumed to be bought with such proceeds – or even assumed to be involved with unlawful activity (e.g. a grow-op house) – are seized and liquidated by the government; this money is subsequently repurposed toward

² Cities in British Columbia have also received limited funding for camera programs from their Civil Forfeiture program. However, I am interested in touching on more systematic approaches to government funding of camera programs, and as such I will not examine British Columbia's funding history in any great detail. Briefly, in 2011, \$1,500 was awarded to Chatelech Secondary School, District #46 in Sechelt to support purchase of surveillance cameras for their secondary school to reduce incidents of vandalism, bullying and theft, and in 2012, a grant of \$11,200 was awarded to the Delta Police Department for the purchase of a re-deployable remote close circuit camera (Sims 2012).

³ Initial research for this study had indicated that a number of cities had applied for funding from the CR program, resulting in the submission of a Freedom of Information (FOI) Request to learn about the program and how many camera systems it had funded. Once the study was underway, I learned that some cities had applied for POC grant funds and had been denied; time constraints and relevance resulted in my decision to not pursue a second FOI request to determine how many camera systems had been funded by the POC grant. Documents were voluntarily given by POC grant representatives, but these did not indicate dollar figures or number of camera systems funded.

assisting victims of crime, crime and victimization prevention, community policing programs (e.g. crime prevention programs for youth) and providing capital costs for new initiatives (such as purchasing communications or information technology and police equipment) (see also Coe and Weisel 2001).

The programs are available to police services and other government ministries (Ministry of the Attorney General 2007). The grant programs identify priority areas; applicants must demonstrate how their proposed initiative falls into the designated areas, as well as satisfying the program's specification that proceeds of crime go toward either victims, the prevention of crime, or remediation efforts. Applicants must propose a plan for their chosen initiative: demonstrating a rationale and justification for the program and how they fit within the objectives laid out by the province (e.g. crime prevention); detailing how much is requested in financial support and how the money will be used; how the program will be delivered and by whom; timelines; and oversight, reporting or auditing procedures. All applications are screened and assessed by the approval committee, which consists of members from the Civil Remedies and Illicit Activities office, the Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services (Ministry of the Attorney General 2007), however the proposed initiatives are not vetted by the committee. Finally, for those who are successful in receiving the grant, progress reports on expenditures as well as a final report on the initiative's outcomes must be provided to the awarding Ministry.

The Influence of Grant Programs on Streetscape Camera Systems

Based on an empirical study of six cities in Ontario, I argue that the CR and POC programs have hitherto exercised three main influences on streetscape systems. First, these programs facilitate faster and easier implementation of camera systems. Prior to the introduction of the CR and POC grants, many camera systems were dependent on funding sourced locally through community organizations. This funding was neither easily obtained nor without considerable local deliberation over both efficacy and privacy. A number of communities have faced difficulties in securing the necessary capital and have experienced delays, or outright rejection, in establishing camera systems due to concerns over spending local funds, privacy violations and the efficacy of cameras. As a result, camera systems can sometimes take years to establish (if at all). Grants enable easier implementation of camera systems: not only do they provide the needed initial capital funds, but they also help to placate concerns over spending, privacy and efficacy by removing the necessity for local money. Grant-funded systems are also established more quickly, as communities are required to spend the grant by the end of the fiscal year; additional resources are often put into action to meet deadlines.

Second, the CR and POC program structure influences camera program design and operation, resulting in passively monitored⁴, crime investigation-oriented systems whose size is largely determined by available funding. Previous systems funded without grant money were established by local organizations for a number of purposes, including public safety, downtown revitalization, and asset protection. Police tend to endorse streetscape cameras as a tool to assist with detection and investigation after crimes have

⁴ Passive monitoring refers to a monitoring style where images from surveillance cameras are not actively watched or monitored. Camera images are typically recorded and retrieved after an incident occurs. These systems differ from live or actively monitored systems, where camera operators are employed to manipulate cameras and watch the camera feed.

occurred. CR and POC funds are only made available to police organizations and this has resulted in the establishment of systems that are purposed toward a law enforcement mandate. International research suggests that if camera surveillance is to be effective, live monitoring with a direct link to police and maximum coverage are needed (Welsh and Farrington 2009). However, the CR and POC grants only fund initial capital purchases and do not cover the cost of live monitoring. Moreover, awards provide only enough funds for basic coverage of downtown areas. Hence, the size, comprehensiveness and quality of systems are often determined by the amount of grant money awarded.

Third, the CR and POC grant programs encourage regional networking between cities not only to learn how to implement, design and operate camera systems, but also to attain grant funding. Prospective cities seek to learn from cities with already-established camera programs, particularly those cities that have also received grant funding from the CR or POC programs. These cities engage in regional “policy tourism” (Gonzales 2011), where policymakers learn about tried and tested initiatives by networking with and visiting cities with operational policies, bringing back lessons and policy instruments to their own communities. Established cities share policies and grant applications as well as informal information and advice with prospective cities that are in the process of learning about camera systems and applying for funding. Regional policy tourism is an invaluable learning strategy for smaller communities who lack the resources to engage in extensive policy research, and the information learned plays a significant role in the formation of subsequent grant applications, policies and programs. Cities that learn from established programs are not only receivers of information, as they can also teach subsequent cities looking to implement camera systems with CR and POC funds. This creates a diffusion

pattern whereby cities that have learned from their predecessors “pass the torch” of advice, information and policies to their successors; former learners become teachers. Through this diffusion process, certain aspects of policy and program design are passed on: in particular, what appears to have diffused is applied knowledge about camera technology and system design in order to facilitate functional systems (e.g. systems that are reliable and transmit images without issue, captures and stores good quality images, etc.) and emphasis on a general ‘spirit’ of privacy protection rather than advocating for particular privacy protection practices that are enshrined in camera policy.

While the CR and POC programs influence aspects of camera systems, and the diffusion process enabled by policy learning and policy tourism suggests a potential for the standardization of streetscape camera programs, variation exists in camera system design and implementation across grant-funded systems, particularly concerning privacy policies. Earlier studies of Canadian camera systems identified Canada’s privacy protection framework⁵, most notably the Information and Privacy Commissioner’s (IPC) *Guidelines for the Use of Video Surveillance Cameras in Public Places* (hereafter referred to as the *Guidelines*) (Cavoukian 2007), as the primary policy instrument for cities establishing streetscape programs (Hier 2010; Hier and Walby 2011). The privacy protection framework, meant to reduce variation in program design and to promote progressive best practices in privacy protection, has paradoxically contributed toward inconsistent implementation processes and design practices. This is due to a number of

⁵ The privacy framework is informed by federal and provincial legislation (Criminal Code, Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Privacy Acts, PIPEDA FIPPA, MFIPPA.), but primarily by guidelines produced by the Office of the Privacy Commissioner (OPC) of Canada and the provincial Offices of Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC) (Johnson 2012).

factors, chief among them being the pragmatic adoption of privacy protection *Guidelines* which are unclear, incomprehensive, and unenforced (Hier 2010).

The diffusion process of CR and POC-funded camera systems continues to perpetuate variation in camera programs. Camera advocates from established cities stress a general need to protect privacy and adhere to privacy legislation, and selectively emphasize and interpret particular aspects of privacy legislation which are reflected in their own camera policies. In lieu of clear and prescriptive directives on how to design and operate systems that have privacy protection built in, prospective cities are left to interpret the information, advice, and policies of their predecessors, as well as navigating and interpreting unclear privacy protection *Guidelines* in determining how to protect privacy and comply with legislation. While the diffusion process of CR/POC-funded systems is more crystallized in that sharing and learning of information and policies occurs more between particular cities (those who have been grant-funded as opposed to networking with any city), the policies and practices that diffuse through CR/POC-funded systems are influenced by ambiguous and unclear privacy protection *Guidelines* that are interpreted and re-interpreted as they are passed down, resulting in varied meanings and understandings, and consequently, varied applications.

While the structure of the grant programs and the diffusion process of advice, information and policies from CR and POC-funded cities have resulted in the spread of certain aspects of camera policies and programs, the legacy of the IPC *Guidelines* continue to enable variation in Canadian streetscape camera systems. The result is a potentially greater number of camera systems being established, using public funds, which continue to lack a consistent vision or character and with no mechanism in place to

promote either. The grant programs represent a missed opportunity by both municipal and provincial government bodies to engage in the promotion and regulation of progressive best practices of streetscape camera systems.

Study Contributions

The study contributes toward an on-going research program on streetscape camera systems in Canada⁶. Hier and Walby have researched the institutionalization of Canadian streetscape systems since the early 2000s. Their research program has revealed five main findings. First, Canadian camera systems have been established mostly through community partnerships involving police, municipal governments, and business organizations. Second, streetscape systems have been both endorsed and resisted by various members of the community (Walby 2006; Hier et al. 2007). Third, the establishment of streetscape systems has been marked by slow, piecemeal diffusion processes⁷, resulting in inconsistent establishment patterns (Hier 2010). Fourth, Canada's privacy protection framework has been the main policy resource informing and coordinating streetscape camera systems. And fifth, application of the privacy protection framework has resulted in inconsistency and both progressive and regressive trends in the design and operation of streetscape surveillance systems (Hier 2010; Hier and Walby 2011).

⁶ The data collection for this thesis is funded by Drs. Hier and Walby through their SSHRC grant "The Institutionalization of Streetscape Surveillance in Canada" (ISSC). The data will be used for the wider purposes of the SSHRC project, in addition to the specific study outlined here. This research is also supported by my own SSHRC Joseph-Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate Scholarship as well as an award from the Sara Spencer Foundation.

⁷ I use the term diffusion to refer to "the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among members of a social system" (Berry and Berry 1999: 171). Diffusion describes a trend of successive adoption of a policy or program – in this case streetscape camera policies and programs.

The current study contributes to this body of work by continuing to investigate the context and changing environment in which Canadian camera systems are established and operated. The Canadian streetscape camera policy context has been heavily influenced by Canada's privacy protection framework, and this has resulted in uneven policy diffusion and variation in the implementation and design of camera systems. The introduction of provincial funding programs alters the policy context of Canadian streetscape surveillance; not only are these grants a resource that enables camera programs materially, but the funding programs' process and the conditions imposed have implications for the ways that camera systems diffuse, are designed and established.

This study examines the policymaking processes of provincially-funded camera systems in order to understand the context in which camera systems are established and operated, and in particular the influence that provincial grant programs have on the implementation, design and diffusion of Canadian streetscape systems. Little research has focused on the influence of government funding on crime control initiatives generally, and streetscape camera programs specifically. Two notable non-Canadian exceptions are William Webster (2004, 2009) and Pete Fussey (2007), whose work has examined British streetscape camera policies and the influence of central government funding schemes; this work has suggested a number of ways that government funding initiatives may influence streetscape camera programs: standardization of streetscape policies and programs; the facilitation of networks, influence on municipal crime policy; and expediting streetscape systems establishment. This research is instructive for the recent introduction of government grants toward Canadian camera systems because it points to tendencies and outcomes that may occur outside of the British context.

Further, the use of CR and POC funds for streetscape cameras exhibit “policy learning” characteristics; that is, policymakers learn from existing policies and programs for the purpose of implementing something similar in their home community. Policy learning is being increasingly used by policymakers as a pragmatic and expedient way of instituting new policy directions. Policymakers in Ontario are increasingly engaging in policy tourism as one of the primary ways to learn about camera programs and the CR and POC grant programs that have funded them. Understanding why and how policies and programs are made is instructive for understanding the outcomes and implications of such policies and programs. Research into policymaking and policy learning in crime and security is limited (but see Jones and Newburn 2007; Bergin 2011; Hier and Walby 2014). As such, insights developed here will be invaluable for future policy studies, particularly in relation to crime policy and streetscape camera policy.

The Study

This study investigates the influence of the CR and POC grant programs on the expansion or establishment of streetscape camera systems in four cities in Ontario: Quinte West, Belleville, Cornwall and Cobourg. I also focus on other cities that unsuccessfully applied for funding from these programs: Orillia and Peterborough⁸. The research design for this study utilizes in-depth interviews and document analysis and the data were analyzed using thematic analysis. Participants in this study include Mayors,

⁸ Cobourg (\$35,500), Belleville (\$183,000), and Cornwall (\$100,597) received funds from the Civil Remedies program in 2010, with Cornwall receiving a second grant (\$147,112) in 2013 for additional camera equipment. In 2011, Quinte West received funds for one camera (\$22,476) and a second grant in 2013 for \$30,000 for three additional cameras. Orillia and Peterborough applied for funds under the Proceeds of Crime grant, but both were unsuccessful; Peterborough also applied for a smaller CR grant, contingent on receiving the POC grant, but this application was also unsuccessful. As of September 2013, Orillia has operated a locally-funded twelve camera streetscape system.

Police Chiefs and Staff Sergeants, Police Service Board members, Business Improvement Association (BIA) members, City Councillors, and city staff; the participants were selected because of their past or current involvement with the provincial grant program and/or the city's streetscape camera system. This project is contextualized and situated among past and current research through an extensive review of the literature and data previously collected through the broader ISSC research program.

The thesis is organized into two sections. Section 1 introduces and sets up the study, and Section 2 presents and discusses the study's data and findings. Section 1 is composed of the introduction (Chapter 1), analytic framework (Chapter 2) and methods (Chapter 3). The introduction establishes the study and the problem to be addressed. The analytical framework for the thesis is addressed in Chapter 2, presenting the major theoretical arguments used to explain the use and proliferation of streetscape systems as well as literature that addresses some shortcomings of these approaches, and situates the study among this scholarship. Chapter 3 details the research design and methodology for the study. Section 2 deals with the data and discusses the findings of the study. Chapter 4-6 details descriptive accounts of the history of each city's streetscape camera program, and provides an analytical engagement and discussion of the major themes and findings from this study. Specifically, Chapter 4 introduces Quinte West and the important role it has played in the diffusion of information about camera systems to many of the other cities in this study. Chapter 5 discusses the other cities in this study that have successfully applied for and received grant funding: Cornwall, Belleville and Cobourg. Chapter 6 describes those cities that were unsuccessful in attaining grant funding for streetscape camera programs: Peterborough and Orillia. Finally, Chapter 7 concludes with an

overview and summary of the findings, and discusses implications for streetscape camera systems, the CR and POC grant programs, and the role of grants in policing and for crime policymaking in general.

Chapter 2

Approaches to Understanding Streetscape Camera Systems

Introduction

Streetscape camera systems across Canada vary in terms of their size, areas targeted for surveillance, program aims, monitoring practices, codes of practice and policies. These variations are influenced in part by local considerations, but they are also affected by external factors, such as federal and provincial privacy frameworks, national and international crime control approaches and global events and politics. The establishment of streetscape camera systems funded by the CR and POC grant programs in Ontario must be understood in the context of local, national and international influences.

In this chapter, I examine the main theoretical arguments advanced to explain the use and proliferation of camera surveillance. I then discuss some of the literature that addresses shortcomings of the dominant approaches to understanding camera surveillance, and argue instead that policy approaches are more appropriate to understand the dynamics involved with camera system establishment. I introduce findings from the British policy context that suggests potential ways that government funding initiatives may influence streetscape camera programs. I then highlight some of the findings on Canadian camera systems and their policy contexts, namely that the Canadian privacy protection framework has paradoxically encouraged variation in how systems are implemented and designed. I argue that the CR and POC grant programs are now a part of the Canadian streetscape policy context and that they pose implications for how

streetscape camera systems diffuse, are designed and established. Finally, I present salient concepts from policymaking literature, and argue that the influence of provincial grant programs on streetscape camera systems can be understood through a focus on policymaking processes.

Theorizing Camera Surveillance

Camera surveillance systems have been used globally since the 1960s as a crime control initiative and as a way to address perceptions of crime and social disorder. Interest in, and application of, camera technology to monitor public spaces increased considerably after the 9/11 terrorist attacks on Washington and New York. Subsequent high-profile attacks elsewhere in North America and abroad (e.g. the 7/7 bus and subway bombings in London, the Boston Marathon bombing in April 2013, a number of mass school shootings across America) have not abated those fears. Such incidents, alongside a general trend toward the growth of surveillance (Lyon 2001, 2007; Ball and Webster 2003) and securitization of everyday life (Bayley and Shearing 1996; Garland 1996; Murphy 2007), continue to lend support to arguments in favour of increased security and surveillance technologies in urban and rural communities. Combined with continual advances in technology (making cameras more reliable, easier to operate and cheaper to obtain), and changing expectations/perceptions of privacy and public spaces, there has been continued – albeit uneven – growth in the use of camera technology for public surveillance across Canada and abroad.

The Panopticon and Neoliberal Responsibilization

Two main theoretical positions have been advanced to explain the use and proliferation of camera surveillance. The first has drawn on the metaphor of the Panopticon, particularly as it concerns the disciplinary effects of camera surveillance (Fyfe and Bannister 1996). The Panopticon was an architectural design proposed by Jeremy Bentham in the late eighteenth century to facilitate the supervision of prisoners from a centralized location. The Panoptic prison design consisted of a central inspection tower surrounded by cells arranged in a semi-circular manner, each cell housing inmates separately. Cells were available to the uni-directional gaze of the inspectors or guards but the inmates were never aware of when they were being watched, inducing a state of uncertainty and ensuring a response of discipline and self-control.

The physical character of camera surveillance draws analogies to Bentham's Panopticon. Surveillance is understood as a group of few watching over many in an asymmetrical way. This understanding has been complicated, however: empirical investigation into the use and operation of streetscape cameras finds that rather than focusing on the public as an undifferentiated whole, monitoring practices tend to selectively focus on particular groups of people based on their physical characteristics and context (Norris and Armstrong 1999; McCahill 2002; Goold 2004; Walby 2005). Moreover, continuous monitoring and instantaneous responses are unlikely if not impossible (Norris and Armstrong 1999).

The second approach has focused on explaining the processes, rather than the effects, involved in establishing streetscape camera systems. This approach has helped to displace the reliance on the panoptic metaphor by highlighting the explanatory importance of neoliberal responsabilization strategies and social ordering techniques (Hier

et al. 2007; Hier 2010). Responsibilization strategies are meant to off-load the responsibility for risk management from central government organizations to local government or non-government organizations. Further, for many commentators, streetscape cameras have been a tool in ordering the division between desirable consumers and un-desirable non-consumers in urban areas (see Bannister, Fyfe and Kearns 1998; Coleman and Sim 1998, 2000; Norris and Armstrong 1999; McCahill 2002; Coleman 2003, 2005).

Coleman and Sim (2000) put forward one of the most influential arguments for this perspective, stating that the establishment of streetscape surveillance in Liverpool involved members of the business community constructing and promoting definitions of urban risk to resonate with the public, encouraging the uptake of new crime control policies. Liverpool's streetscape system is presented as based on neoliberal patterns of consumption, concerned with attracting consumers and marginalizing undesirables whose presence was irreconcilable with the newly-promoted image of the city as a 'safe place to do business' (see also Coleman 2003, 2005). This case study highlights the discursive processes involved in bringing about streetscape systems, particularly the human (inter)actions and decisions taken. It also exposes the role that business elites/interests can have in establishing streetscape systems; indeed, most systems operate in commercial areas, indicating consumerism and material interests as an important aspect of streetscape systems.

Despite the important contributions of this second approach, the insights produced here have not advanced beyond the determinism found within the panoptic accounts. Coleman and Sim's analysis focused primarily on business elite and did not engage with

other community actors who may have played a role in either promoting or resisting streetscape initiatives (Hier et al. 2007; Hier 2010). Further, it relies heavily on the assumption that the claims-making activities by a particular group (business elite) was well-received and taken up by the public; their focus does not take up the possibility of counter-claims making activities and discourses, and subsequently the potential failure of responsabilization strategies to garner support (Hier et al. 2007; Hier 2010).

Toward Policy Approaches

A number of scholars have responded to the two dominant surveillance approaches and have offered their own explanations to address these shortcomings. In particular, the work of Hier and colleagues (Hier 2004, 2010; Hier, Walby and Greenberg 2006; Hier et al. 2007) has problematized the top-down conception of power that these approaches posit, arguing that they do not conceive of streetscape systems (and other regulatory measures for that matter) that are generated – or resisted – from various social positions, and for various reasons; these motivations go beyond reducing and deterring crime, or for interests of consumerism or profitability. In many cases, some form of social anxiety is present and antecedent to the implementation of streetscape camera systems (Walby 2006; Hier 2010), and individuals or grassroots community organizations are just as likely as state organizations (e.g. police) to make calls for camera programs. The over-reliance on ‘official’ discourses and accounts from prioritized subject positions (e.g. business elites) misses the micro-level claims- and decision-making processes of the diverse and many policy actors involved.

To that end, Hier and colleagues' research has highlighted the need to look at not only the extra-local context that influences the establishment of streetscape surveillance (e.g. the increasing use of neoliberal responsabilization strategies in crime control), but to also examine the local context in which camera programs are developed and implemented, by whom, and for what reasons; in short, an approach is needed that moves beyond broad theoretical and cultural arguments and focuses on streetscape camera policymaking and its dynamics in local settings. The dominant approaches to understanding camera surveillance mostly ignore the political and policy processes on the ground. As such, they are unable to account for the multiple – sometimes competing – motivations and rationales for implementing (or resisting) camera systems, the many actors involved, the decisions made (and opposed), and the factors which both enable and constrain the establishment and operation of camera systems. There is a diversity of actions and responses to establishing streetscape camera initiatives, and both the local and extra-local context matters for why, how and where such systems are established; focusing exclusively on a singular explanation for why camera systems are implemented misses these important factors, and ultimately tells us little about *actual* camera surveillance systems. Approaching camera surveillance with a policy focus allows us to capture the dynamic policy environment without imposing determinism, therefore enabling a better understanding of the processes and outcomes associated with camera system establishment.

The influence of government funds on streetscape systems: The British case

Analyses of camera surveillance have begun to address the policy dimensions involved in designing, implementing, and legitimizing systems. Two notable non-Canadian exceptions are William Webster (2004, 2009) and Pete Fussey (2007), whose

work has examined the British streetscape camera policy context and the influence of central government funding schemes. British policy studies suggest a number of ways that government funding initiatives may influence camera programs: standardization of streetscape policies and programs; the facilitation of networks, influence on municipal crime policy; and expediting streetscape systems establishment.

Webster's work in particular has focused on the policy diffusion of British camera systems and argues that British camera systems were initially developed in the absence of any formal government regulations or policies. British systems were encouraged and facilitated by the UK government's camera funding initiatives and promotional policies (2004, 2009; see also McCahill and Norris 2002; Norris, McCahill and Wood 2004; Fussey 2007)⁹. Government funding initiatives provided a sense of legitimacy to camera programs and they contributed to standardizing the design process by prescribing and funding particular kinds of systems, and encouraging – in some cases necessitating – the formation of community partnerships. Policy networks were established as camera systems diffused; cities consulted with each other over the use and positive promotion of cameras. Common approaches to the installation and use of systems were established, in effect regulating camera systems. An informal administrative structure developed among networks of service providers based on voluntary self-regulation, but also co-regulation among service providers and policy-makers emerged in this non-governmental policy environment. In short, British government funding initiatives contributed toward the standardization of camera policy and programs.

⁹ The British Home Office created a number of initiatives for camera system establishment, and spent over £250 million funding approximately 580 camera systems (McCahill and Norris 2002; Norris, McCahill and Wood 2004)

The second effect of grant programs is to encourage, or sometimes necessitate, partnerships between local government authorities and organizations (Mackay 2003: 44). Networks among police, municipal governments, Downtown Business Improvement Associations (DBIAs), and community groups are formed to support the implementation and operation of camera systems. These organizations work together to develop a camera program and its policy, to secure funding, to generate community support and to operate and maintain the system once in place. Through these networks, on-going relationships are established as camera programs often require continual cooperation – and funding – to operate and maintain the system. Thus, stable networks are formed, whereby connections are maintained across groups/organizations, and responsibility is shared (though not always equally). Further, because the funding initiative is a competitive process, not all applicants are successful. Norris and Armstrong argue that in the UK, this stimulated a “demand for CCTV way and above that which was funded. Those who had put considerable effort into making the bid [...] did not suddenly relinquish their aspirations for [streetscape camera] systems” (1999: 36-7). Thus, for cities who are not successful, the existence of a pot of funding creates a demand to work together to secure that funding in one way or another (Norris et al. 2004: 122). In sum, the existence of government funding can encourage the creation of standing security networks, whether or not funding has been successfully attained.

It is important to note that while the camera programs and their policies are made and carried out at the municipal level, a policy agenda amenable to – and indeed, supportive of – camera systems is first established at upper levels of government (Webster 2004: 244-5). Thus, governing bodies above the municipal level are included in

the “policy network” (Marsh and Rhodes 1992) that has a key goal of improving society through the diffusion and operation of streetscape camera systems (Webster 2004: 244-5). Without a national policy agenda favourable to surveillance cameras, the United Kingdom would not have the extensive proliferation of camera systems that they do. In other words, extensive network-formation concerning streetscape camera systems occurred in a context of governmental support.

Third, grant programs influence municipal crime control policy by directly funding particular initiatives and through the conditions placed on such funds. Obtaining funding often means adhering to government-determined criteria. The government designates priority areas, thus creating boundaries for funding, and also imposes conditions on that money (Fussey 2007: 238). By designating priority areas, potential grantees must demonstrate how their proposed initiative falls into such areas. This may result in many proposals becoming ineligible, or potential grantees are forced to tailor or even change their projects to fit the identified areas (see also Crank and Langworthy 1996). Once funding is secured, municipal authorities are required to comply with conditions placed on that money (e.g. the money cannot be used for anything not specified in the initial application, all funds used must be accounted for, a tender process is required, public consultations may be needed, etc.). Further, Emily Owens argues that grant monies can also influence crime policy indirectly: funds that would have otherwise been used toward the funded initiative are repurposed toward other means (2007). This can have permanent effects on municipal government expenditures. Thus, not only does the government determination and funding of priority areas *influence* municipal agendas (Fussey 2007: 238), they could also *set* municipal agendas. For example, David Mackay

argues British “central government funding is being used to entice local authorities to carry out a central government political programme” (2003: 46).

Finally, fourth, government grant programs expedite camera system establishment. Funding is oftentimes as a considerable impediment to implementing camera systems; the sudden availability of externally-sourced money not only materially facilitates programs, but it can also abate other forms of resistance. While there are many considerations camera advocates and their publics have about streetscape camera systems, money is consistently chief among them. The conversation around pressures for funding can “paper over” conflicts concerning streetscape camera system implementation (Fussey 2007: 248) in such a way that funding is constructed as the major issue. That is, if funding is seen as the major barrier (rather than, say, concerns about proper use of systems or privacy concerns), it takes centre stage in negotiations around streetscape cameras and other (equally valid) issues can fall by the wayside. Other concerns about cameras may exist, but if funding is constructed as *the* major concern, these other issues may pale in comparison – and if that major impediment is removed, the barriers to streetscape camera establishment may attenuate.

While the availability of government funding and the conditions imposed on such funds can have particular implications, these are not deterministic. Indeed, the availability of public funding does not necessarily mean that cameras will then be installed; public support is also instrumental in determining whether streetscape camera systems will go ahead (Fussey 2007; and see Hier et al. 2007; Hier 2010). However, while public support and other considerations are prerequisites for camera systems, resources must be in place to actually install systems; support is for naught if funding is lacking. As Pete Fussey

argues, “desires for surveillance often only run as deep as financial prudence allows” (2007: 250) and thus, the odds in favour of streetscape camera implementation rise considerably if a major impediment – a lack of funding – is removed from the equation.

The Canadian policy context

The work of Hier and colleagues has examined the Canadian streetscape policy context. This research has shown that the main resource informing the design and implementation of camera systems has been Canada’s privacy protection framework (Hier 2010; Hier and Walby 2011). In the early 2000s, federal and provincial guidelines for using public-area video surveillance were published – the *IPC Guidelines* – with the hopes of encouraging compliance with best practices and privacy protection. The *Guidelines* have since been taken up in most cities that have established streetscape systems; however, despite aiming to reduce diverse implementation, design and monitoring practices, the *Guidelines* inadvertently facilitate variation and inconsistencies. This is due to a number of factors: the *Guidelines* are neither comprehensive nor clearly explained; compliance with the *Guidelines* is not compulsory; privacy commissioners capable of “enforcing” the framework have typically shied away from taking ownership, instead opting for a pragmatic approach to privacy protection, and their role is unclear (Hier 2010; see Bennett 2003 regarding privacy commissioners). This pragmatic approach has influenced streetscape systems by both enabling resistance efforts as well as varied approaches to establishing and operating systems (Hier 2010)¹⁰.

¹⁰ There is considerable variation in design and inconsistent implementation patterns regarding the nature of and value placed on public consultations, the role of city council endorsement, data-sharing agreements, privacy impact assessments, signage practices, consistency in monitoring practices, how information is handled and disposed, and what information informs needs assessment (Hier 2010: 4)

Beyond the variation and inconsistency fostered by the privacy protection framework, camera policies also vary due to selective policy adoption and reinvention practices. Cities establishing streetscape systems interpret new and existing policies based on their own needs and the local context in which their policies are created. Hier and Walby argue, “camera surveillance policy can take on unique substantive meanings in specific policymaking sites and [...] policy meanings can mutate when imported policy frameworks are interpreted in and applied to local settings” (2014: 153-4). While the privacy protection *Guidelines* have had a considerable, albeit varied, influence on the policymaking of streetscape camera policy, camera systems are always established in local settings, and as such the *Guidelines* are always interpreted and implemented in ways that reflect the local context, history, struggles and decisions. The Canadian streetscape camera policy context has hitherto been marked by considerable variation and inconsistency in implementation and design due to ambiguous privacy *Guidelines* and idiosyncratic interpretations and applications of policy.

Policy Learning and Policy Tourism

Hier and Walby (2011) have argued that due the lack of a coordinating government policy, particularly concerning funding, Canadian streetscape camera implementation and design has been primarily based on a small number of quasi-legal documents and the promotional efforts of key regional camera advocates. The Canadian streetscape camera policy context has hitherto been heavily influenced by the privacy protection framework, and this has resulted in uneven policy diffusion and variation in the implementation and design of camera systems. The recent introduction of CR and

POC grant programs alters the policy context of Canadian streetscape surveillance, and has the capability to change how systems are established and operated. Policy studies of the effects of government funding initiatives on British streetscape camera programs suggests potential ways that Canadian camera systems may be similarly affected by provincial grant programs.

The literatures on policy and policymaking have identified several important concepts that have advanced our understanding of what policy is and how policies are made. Of particular relevance to the current study are the concepts of policy learning and policy tourism. Policy learning is when one community learns from another community in order to establish a similar policy or program, and policy tourism refers to consulting/visiting other communities to learn about policy. Canadian cities have consulted one another regionally and nationally to learn about camera systems and their policies, often physically visiting communities with established camera systems to benefit from informal guidance and advice as well as formal policy instruments.

The term “policy” refers to broader statements of intention, generally denoting a particular direction that policymakers want to take. This is in distinction to programs, which refer to the specific means of a course of action used to implement policies (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000: 12). Policymaking can be understood as a process, or a policy cycle: a set of analytically distinct set of functional activities which contribute toward the culmination of a policy (Anderson 2010: vii). While it is a useful heuristic tool to think of this process as occurring in distinct and linear stages – problem identification and agenda setting, formulating courses of action, policy adoption, policy implementation and policy evaluation (Anderson 2010: 3) – in reality, policymaking is dynamic. Indeed,

Peck and Theodore (2010) argue that the policymaking process does not always follow a straightforward, rational, linear and complete path, but rather, it is constantly mobile and mutating.

New policy directions can be instigated from a number of actors and in response – or anticipation – to a number of social developments. Policymaking does not occur only within government by powerful bureaucrats (Stone 2004; Hier 2010), and it is not always in response to some discontent with the status quo (Dolowitz and Marsh 1996). Hier and Walby’s research suggests that regional policy networks (Benz and Fürst 2002) are increasingly being established between cities for the purposes of sharing information about streetscape camera policies and programs. This practice is known as policy learning¹¹. The idea is that there is a “tendency for some policy decisions to be made on the basis of knowledge of past experiences and knowledge-based judgments as to future expectations” (Bennett and Howlett 1992: 287) and that information and policy instruments from one setting are borrowed to develop programmes and policies in another (Dolowitz and Marsh 1996). The objects of learning can include a) goals; b) content; c) instruments; d) programs e) institutions; f) ideologies; g) ideas and attitudes; and h) negative lessons (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000: 12). Learning can take place across time (e.g. adopting a policy from the past), within and across countries, and there are different degrees of learning: copying, emulation, synthesis, hybridization, and inspiration (Rose 1993). Policy learning occurs for several reasons, such as external or

¹¹ The umbrella term for the practice of learning from and sharing policies developed in other jurisdictions is known as policy transfer. The policy transfer literature has been revised and expanded due to theoretical and empirical contributions of academics in this field, subsequent that there are many other literatures that focus on different kinds or aspects of the use of policies in other settings. These include policy learning, policy mobilities, policy diffusion, policy emulation and/or policy convergence; however, each have different implications for what happens to policies and how. Therefore, I opted to use the term policy learning, as it best characterized the use of policies from other settings for this study.

internal pressure to adopt policies, or a desire to benefit from other successful policies in a prescribed area (Bennett and Howlett 1992; Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). While there has always been an interest in looking elsewhere for examples of best practices, the field of policy studies has seen an increasing use of policy learning as a particular type of policymaking process.

Most policy learning literature focuses on international/national processes and ignores sub-national regional or local levels. Some recent policy studies have begun to look at policy learning that occurs below the national level, highlighting the importance of regional or urban policymaking. For example, Benz and Fürst (2002) look at policy learning that happens at the regional level (e.g. the provincial, territorial or state level), McCann (2008) focuses on “urban policy mobilities”, referring to how policies move between cities and towns, regionally or internationally and Wolman and Page (2002) examine policies that move between local governments within a region. Wolman and Page’s work is instructive for the current study, as it points to particular considerations and tendencies for policymaking that occurs within a region. In particular, peer-to-peer contact with local/regional neighbours is highly valued and plays an important role in the policymaking process. Despite learning beneficial information from elsewhere, cities must still tailor these lessons to their own local context, needs and goals. The need to emphasize the “local” in the policymaking and policy learning process is critical, as policies are always interpreted and implemented in local settings (Wolman and Page 2002; Sheldon 2004; Hier and Walby 2014). Though adaptation might suggest that policies are made stronger and more comprehensive through learning and refining policies for local areas, this is not always the case (Hays 1996).

The process of policymaking begins with identifying a problem and subsequently evaluating potential policies; in terms of policy learning, this involves policymakers determining whether a policy from elsewhere will achieve their needs. For a policy to be taken up, policy actors must “sell” the policy (Béland 2009). This framing and selling is backed by the work of “prospective policy evaluation” (Mossberger and Wolman 2003; see also Hoyt 2006), the research (loosely termed) that policy actors do to learn about policies elsewhere and how they are relevant and applicable to their local context (Hoyt 2006). Part of prospective policy evaluation involves “policy tourism” (González 2011) by policy actors. Policy actors visit cities with operational policies and bring back evidence in the form of policies, reports, brochures, photos, or perhaps most important, word-of-mouth stories and advice (McCann 2011). The visits and evaluations of the information learned are not necessarily rigorous or informed by any methodology (Wolman and Page 2002; Hoyt 2006; Marsden et al. 2011); rather, information is gathered informally and randomly and decisions on where to visit are based on pragmatic concerns like geographical proximity or cultural similarity (Marsden et al. 2011). The information learned through these visits can play a significant role in the policies and programs subsequently created by the “tourist” cities, as well as leading to the legitimizing discourse backing the policy, providing reassurance that policy adoption will be successful. Policy tourism can also involve a reverse flow, where policy actors are invited to prospective cities to promote their policy.

Though policy learning involves cities learning about an existing policy for use in their own setting, suggesting policies may be copied or emulated, it in fact involves a series of decisions. Policy learning is just as contingent and messy as policymaking that

begins “from scratch” (indeed, no policy exists in a vacuum and every policy is affected by/affects other policies). Understanding how decisions are made and by whom, and how decisions are interpreted, put into action and appraised is essential to understanding the policymaking process. Policies have real effects for individuals and groups, and thus understanding how policy is made is just as important as understanding what policies do. The Canadian streetscape policy context has changed with the introduction of provincial grants, the implications of which have yet to be examined.

Chapter 3

Research Design and Methodology

Introduction

The research design for this study utilized in-depth interviews and document analysis. The study's focus was informed by past and current research through an extensive review of the literature on streetscape camera surveillance systems, civil asset forfeiture, policy learning and policy tourism, and government funding of municipal initiatives (particularly municipal crime control initiatives). The study was also informed by data previously collected from 2009-2011 across Ontario as part of a wider project on the institutionalization of Canadian streetscape camera programs.

Prior to data collection, I consulted a number of interviews that were part of a study that explored questions concerning when streetscape camera systems were first implemented, who was involved, what the motivating reasons were, what processes were involved in bringing systems to fruition, public and media opinion, the system design (e.g. how many cameras, how are they monitored and images dealt with, etc), and so on. Particularly informative were sixteen interviews conducted with representatives from the six primary and secondary cities of this study: these representatives included Police Chiefs, Mayors, City Managers, City Councillors, and members of Police Service Boards, BIAs, and Chamber of Commerce. In addition, one interview was conducted with a representative from the Ministry of the Attorney General.

These interviews revealed the existence of the Civil Remedies grant program and that a number of cities in Ontario had applied or were in the process of applying for

provincial grant funding for streetscape camera systems. The previously collected data was reviewed to gain familiarity with the cities, and it assisted in the development of interview questions for the current research. The present study explores the impact and influence of provincial grant funding programs on streetscape camera systems and also serves as a follow-up for the existing research program, allowing us to see whether, how and why the camera program's design, implementation and/or operation has changed since the earlier interviews.

Sampling and Access

The four primary cities – Quinte West, Belleville, Cornwall and Cobourg – were selected because each city had obtained CR and/or POC grant funding to establish or expand their streetscape camera system. Although the secondary cities, Orillia and Peterborough, were unsuccessful in attaining grant funds, this study is interested in learning about unsuccessful grant applications in addition to successful applications.

Using a snowball sampling technique (Ritchie, Lewis and Elam 2003: 94), recruitment of participants began by utilizing existing contacts at each of the cities. I asked participants who participated in the initial study for follow-up interviews to both update developments and to ask questions specifically related to my project. New participants were also identified, primarily through word of mouth (from participants of previous study) or through internet research (e.g. news articles, organization websites). Thus, cases were carefully selected insofar as they were relevant to the study's research objectives (Patton 1990). The participants were selected because of their past or current involvement with the provincial grant program and/or the city's streetscape camera

system. Participants in this study included Mayors, Police Chiefs and Staff Sergeants, Police Service Board (PSB) members, Downtown Business Improvement Association (DBIA) members, City Councillors, city staff, government representatives and representatives of grant programs in order to learn about the administration and evaluation of grant programs. This approach allowed for additional participants to be included as they were identified prior to the city visits, however no additional participants were recruited during fieldwork.

The sample reflects the diversity of actors involved in establishing and operating streetscape camera systems and generated data on all aspects of streetscape camera establishment and operation. Analysis of the participants' experiences formed the basis for a descriptive account of these processes. The analysis focused on the experiences of key participants such as police representatives who had a greater, hands-on involvement in designing and implementing the camera program; their responses spoke better to the research questions of this study. The experiences of other participants, such as DBIA members, were also scrutinized as camera programs involve consultation and input from community stakeholders, and without their support camera programs may not come to fruition. The voices of these participants were included in the analysis given their important involvement in supporting an initiative that ultimately had an impact upon an entire community.

The participants were informed of the study's objectives as well as expectations for their involvement; I also sent an explanation of the study to their workplace ahead of our in-person meeting (the participant consent form doubled as a description of the study). The participants were told the study would examine the history of their city's

camera program, and they would be asked to describe their experiences in applying for/attaining provincial grant funding for camera programs and what processes and outcomes had resulted from their engagement with the grant program. For provincial grant program representatives, I explained that the study intended to learn about the grant program's administrative and evaluative processes and their involvement with cities/applications which had applied for streetscape camera funding.

Data Collection

The study triangulates in-depth, face-to-face interviews and document analysis. Using multiple methods has the advantage of generating new knowledge by combining diverse kinds of data (Moran and Butler 2001), producing different/additional constructions of a phenomenon, and can increase the accuracy and validity of findings (Moran-Ellis et al. 2006). Equal priority was given to collecting and analyzing each type of data, as both are vital in answering addressing the study's research aims. The in-depth interviews were guided by the insights learned from examining existing data from the previous study, which helped avoid duplication, identified areas which needed further exploration and new areas specific to this study's aims. I conducted 24 interviews with 30 participants (some interviews had more than one participant¹²) from both the primary and secondary cities, and two interviews with representatives of provincial grant programs. Participants from the primary and secondary cities had past and current involvement with the development and implementation of streetscape camera systems and/or were involved in the process of obtaining provincial grant funding for camera programs. The interviews

¹² I interviewed three police representatives in Quinte West together in one interview, two DBIA members in Cornwall in one interview, two DBIA members in Cobourg in one interview, two DBIA members in Peterborough in one interview, and two Police Service Board members from Orillia in one interview.

sought to explore the rationales and processes involved in establishing or expanding camera systems in addition to the policy/program development and implementation that buttress such systems. I also interviewed provincial grant program representatives to gain an understanding of grant programs, their processes and rationales from the perspective of the grantor. The interviews were semi-structured and guided by an interview schedule, though emergent topics were explored as they occurred (Wengraf 2001). The interviews length ranged from thirty minutes to nearly two hours, and all but one were digitally recorded (the participant declined a recording). The interviews were later transcribed verbatim for data analysis.

Official documents were sought out and collected from organizations in the primary and secondary cities, as well as from the provincial grant program representatives. Documents were analyzed to understand the processes of developing streetscape camera systems and attaining provincial grant funding at the municipal and provincial level. Important information was learned from these documents: an understanding of how things “officially” work (or how they *should* work), a tracing of events historically, and information less amenable to recall error (especially a few years after the fact) and self-censoring (e.g. participants may opt to present information in a particular way but the official documents may contradict or complicate this).

I requested copies of relevant documents from interview participants and most obliged. These documents included: grant applications and camera system budgets; correspondence between applicants and provincial grant program representatives; reports, presentations and fact sheets on cameras; surveys; letters of support for cameras; correspondence between organizations concerning cameras (e.g. police and the DBIA),

including memorandums of understanding (MoUs); camera system policies/procedures; meeting minutes; newspaper articles; organizational planning documents; and maps. Documents were provided voluntarily from representatives of the Proceeds of Crime grant, administered by the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, and a Freedom of Information (FOI) request was submitted to obtain documents from the Civil Remedies program, administered by the Ministry of the Attorney General. The FOI request was submitted to gather all applications submitted to the Civil Remedies program which had requested funding for streetscape camera programs, and any administrative and evaluative documents concerning these applications. This process involved mailing an FOI request to the Ministry of the Attorney General and a few phone calls were exchanged to clearly define which documents would be searched for and released. The FOI documents were mailed approximately six months after the FOI request was submitted. Documents received from the POC grant program included: calls for grant proposals, application guidelines and application forms, templates for contracts between grant recipients and the ministry supplying the grant funds, progress report and final report templates (for budget), performance measures template, grant review committee scoring sheets and a booklet on crime prevention in Ontario. Documents received through the Freedom of Information request for the Civil Remedies program included: all grant applications in support of streetscape camera programs since 2006, calls for applications and application guidelines, evaluations from the previous grant year (2012-3) and an informational booklet produced by the Ontario IPC concerning surveillance.

Each of the above techniques were used to explore, through their own unique method, the research questions posed in this study, including the four ways provincial

funding programs can influence streetscape camera systems: standardization of streetscape policies and programs; facilitation of networks; influence on municipal crime policy; and expediting streetscape camera systems establishment. These research questions shaped how the interviews were conducted and how the documents were scrutinized for relevant information on these processes.

Data Analysis

The analysis followed a qualitative descriptive design (Lincoln and Guba 1985; Sandelowski 2000) and primarily derived explanations of streetscape camera systems from the subjective perspective of key participants in the study. Implicit explanations were also inferred from context and structure-specific information generated through analysis (Ritchie, Spencer and O'Connor 2003:252-7). I employed thematic analysis to discover salient themes in the data (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane 2008) and depicted these themes in relation to each other and the data set as a whole. Thematic analysis facilitates efficient data management, allowing descriptive, explanatory and interpretive accounts of the data set. It involves going beyond the mere identification of patterns in the data, and assists in a more robust exploration of the data in relation to the study's research questions (Attride-Stirling 2001).

Researchers using thematic analysis are encouraged to explicitly state whether they will approach the data inductively or deductively, and thus whether the analysis is theory or data-driven (Boyatzis 1998; Ryan and Bernard 2003; Dixon-Woods et al. 2005: 47, Braun and Clarke 2006); this has implications for how the data are coded and thus how it is described and interpreted. This project is informed by past empirical research as

well as the existing literature, which has shaped the research design and questions posed. Research findings from the previous study informed my own work and constitute an appropriate background for the analysis of the data. However, despite the existence of a substantial amount of previous data, the approach to coding for the current data was inductive and data-driven. Codes and themes were derived exclusively from the interview and document data collected for the thesis research. The two data sets were then integrated at the point of analysis to generate a more robust, multi-faceted understanding of the phenomenon and produce “a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts.” (Moran-Ellis et al. 2006: 50; 54-5).

The intent of this thematic analysis was to identify generalized statements from participants about their beliefs, attitudes, and experiences in relation to the funding and implementation of streetscape camera systems. Themes capture “something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set” (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 82). Several themes were identified as common to all cities whereas a number of the themes were more prevalent in particular cities. Common themes are found throughout the data chapters, and discussed in-depth in Chapter 7, whereas particular themes are used to construct more descriptive accounts of the experiences of participants in Chapters 4-6.

The thematic analysis followed steps adapted from Ritchie et al. (2003) and Braun and Clarke (2006). The first step involved familiarizing myself with the data and identifying initial codes. Codes are best understood as descriptors that capture the qualitative richness of the phenomenon in question (Boyatzis 1998). These initial codes were assigned to the data; however, the analysis was “reflexive and interactive”

(Sandelowski 2000) and additional codes were identified as I worked through both the documents and interview data. Using the method of constant comparison (Boeije 2002), the new codes were compared with data tagged with existing codes to assure that new patterns or concepts in the data were not captured by the initial codes.

The next step involved “collating codes into potential themes, and gathering all data relevant to each potential theme” (Braun and Clarke 2006: 87). Themes are understood as “a pattern found in the information that at minimum describes and organizes the possible observation and at maximum interprets aspects of the phenomenon” (Boyatzis 1998: 4). This task was facilitated by a code inventory where each code was named, defined and described so as to establish clear boundaries of how they could be used to identify themes (Boyatzis 1998; Ritchie et al. 2003: 221). The codes were then sorted and grouped together into basic themes, organizing themes, and global themes (Attride-Stirling 2001: 388). The “basic themes” were closely derived from the data and then grouped into clusters of signification called organizing themes that summarize the principal assumptions of a group of basic themes (Attride-Stirling 2001: 389). The organizing themes informed the descriptive accounts contained in Chapters 4-6. Finally, above the “organizing themes” are “global themes”, the highest-order themes; “they encompass the principal metaphors in the data as a whole [...] they are macro themes that summarize and make sense of clusters of lower-order themes abstracted from and supported by the data” (Attride-Stirling 2001: 389). These themes informed the discussion contained in Chapter 7. Here, the original research questions driving the study and the theoretical concerns which underpin them were addressed with arguments grounded in the global themes. A thematic summary for this study can be found in

Appendix 1, where the salient themes for all three levels are depicted as well as the relationships between them.

Section 2

Findings, Analysis and Discussion

Introduction

The study's primary intent is to explore how Canadian streetscape camera systems have been influenced by the Civil Remedies and Proceeds of Crime grant programs. This section of the thesis deals with the data and discusses the findings of the study. Chapters 4-6 provide a descriptive account of each city's streetscape camera program and its policymaking process, and present an analytical assessment of how each of the influences plays out in each city, as well as across cities. Chapter 7 summarizes and discusses the central arguments of the thesis and draws out implications for streetscape camera programs as well as grant programs and their influence on crime policy.

Chapter 4 focuses on Quinte West, the first city in this study to establish a camera program. For this reason, it has played an important role in the diffusion of information about camera systems to the other cities in this study. Not only did advocates from Quinte West visit nearby cities to promote the use of cameras, but Quinte West has also been visited multiple times by inquiring cities looking to establish camera systems. They served as an important resource for cities in the region, providing information on their camera system technology, design and operation, and advising on aspects of privacy protection policy and legislation. Chapter 5 discusses the other cities in this study that have successfully applied for and received grant funding: Cornwall, Belleville and Cobourg. The various influences of the CR and POC grant programs are revealed through descriptions of each city's camera program history; the descriptions also detail the networking and policy learning/tourism that occurred with other cities, Quinte West in

particular, in developing and implementing their camera programs. Chapter 6 describes those cities that did not attain grant funding for streetscape camera programs: Peterborough and Orillia. Cities who do not receive grant funds face greater difficulty and considerable delays in implementing camera systems, if they are able to do so at all. Peterborough and Orillia also engaged in policy learning and tourism with other cities in this study, Quinte West and Belleville in particular, with the latter having a more influential role for these cities as Belleville also advised on the grant application process. Quotes from participants in each city are used throughout these chapters to illustrate the themes and the experiences of the participants in their own words (Sandelowski 1994).

Collectively, these chapters detail the unique context and history of each city and their influences on how camera systems and provincial grant programs are taken up, by whom, and with what result. Each chapter demonstrates participants' experiences with the provincial grant programs and how it influenced the design, implementation and use of their city camera system. Also documented is the nature and extent of their involvement with other cities who have engaged with these funding programs and how this has affected their own proposals, applications, camera programs, etc. These chapters also survey the participants' views on streetscape camera systems as a crime control solution, the process of crafting a proposal and application for provincial funding, and the implementation of the camera system. Participants reflect on how working with other organizations facilitated the grant applications and implementation of streetscape cameras. The chapters also focus on how participants envision the fit of streetscape camera systems into the designated priority areas set out by the provincial government, and how the initiative shaped or influenced municipal approaches to crime control and

their delivery. Finally, the chapters report on the challenges participants identified in regards to streetscape camera system implementation and what effect they thought this had on camera systems; they were also asked to reflect on the nature and importance of government funding in the facilitation of their community's streetscape system, and whether the provincial grant has expedited the process.

Finally, Chapter 7 brings together the data from all cities in the study, and discusses the central arguments and themes with respect to how the CR and POC grant programs have influenced streetscape camera programs. For this purpose, participants' responses and documents were compared across cities. The discussion highlights how the CR and POC grant programs link cities to one another and how cities rely on the policy resources and advice provided by neighbouring cities despite the strong influence exerted by the privacy protection framework, namely the *IPC Guidelines*. This kind of regional networking creates a diffusion pattern where cities who have learned from their predecessors "pass the torch" of advice, information and policies to their successors. This chapter lays out overarching themes that cut across the cities in this study. These are: 1) there are many arguments raised in support of cameras, 2) grant programs facilitate faster and easier implementation of camera systems, 3) grants influence camera design and operation, and 4) grants encourage regional networking, policy learning and policy tourism between cities (see Appendix 1 for the thematic summary). The chapter also highlights implications for existing and future streetscape programs, the CR and POC grant programs, and the role of grants in policing and for crime policymaking in general.

Chapter 4

Quinte West

Introduction

This chapter discusses the City of Quinte West's Downtown Camera Program. Quinte West operates the largest number of cameras and longest running streetscape camera system of the cities in this study, as well as having one of the largest systems in the province, at twenty-nine cameras. Most of the funding for the city's system comes primarily from the city; however, they have also received two grants from the Civil Remedies program to purchase additional cameras.

Quinte West has played an important role in the diffusion of information among neighbouring cities about streetscape systems. In particular, representatives from Quinte West have advised their regional counterparts concerning the design, implementation, operation and policies of streetscape systems, and they have advocated for the use of camera technology in other small cities who share similar issues (e.g. perception of safety, drug abuse, graffiti, etc. in downtowns). The diffusion of information has taken place primarily through policy tourism, with a number of cities (all but one from this study, and many others outside of it) visiting Quinte West to learn about camera systems, as well as representatives from Quinte West visiting other cities and organizations to promote camera systems.

Camera Program Background and Beginnings

Quinte West is located on the western end of the Bay of Quinte, on Lake Ontario. Quinte West is also the gateway to the Lake Ontario terminus of the Trent-Severn waterway, a canal which connects Lake Huron and Lake Ontario, facilitating recreation and tourism in the area. The municipality of Quinte West connects several communities, including Frankford and Trenton (approximate population 43,086 in 2011) (Statistics Canada 2011f). The city is home to 8 Wing Trenton, a large Canadian Forces military base, as well as many large commercial and retail companies.

Quinte West's camera program began in 2007. Cameras were introduced following a significant investment into the revitalization of downtown Trenton (Quinte West's commercial hub). The city of Quinte West embarked on a downtown beautification and revitalization project to improve their downtown areas, making them more inviting for residents to visit commercial areas, and to address some of the issues in the downtown around graffiti, vandalism, property crimes, public mischief and a general feeling of insecurity. Prior to and concurrent with the revitalization efforts, a number of initiatives were implemented, including the introduction of a community policing station in downtown Frankford, bike and foot patrols, new by-laws (for noise, nuisances, and prohibiting the sale of "graffiti implements" to minors), and improved lighting. Toward the end of the revitalization project, cameras were proposed by city, business and police representatives as a way to protect their investment into the downtown area, but also to provide another tool for security and law enforcement to deter and detect some of the on-going issues in Quinte West.

So, the reason we put cameras in place in the first place was we felt we could improve the area and get rid of some of the problems if people were more aware that they were being watched. So, I think it was to get rid of the feeling of drugs, graffiti, people being able to walk out, there's

a lot of older people, who would like to just walk around the downtown. [...] I think it was implemented for that reason for people to feel safer and as part of the on-going, -make the area more good for business coming in and improving the streetscape (Downtown Business Association (DBIA) participant).

It was just a security issue, another measure to fight crime, to protect the residents in the downtown area. There wasn't anything specific, there wasn't a major crime or anything at the time, it was just another service that the city could potentially utilize (Police participant).

Implementing the System and Policy Creation

The proposal to implement cameras in the downtown was created by the city's Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) with help from the IT department. The proposal was put to the Police Service Board and then to city council, where it was favourably received by both. It was determined that the Quinte West OPP¹³, rather than the city, would have control of and responsibility for the camera system as the OPP had the expertise to operate the cameras for law enforcement purposes, and it would give them immediate access to utilize and act on information provided by the camera images. Thus, the police took ownership of the initiative under the leadership of Inspector Earl Johns, the then-Quinte West OPP Detachment Commander, while the camera technology and infrastructure would be managed by the City of Quinte West (with the help of an IT company). The city engaged in a Request for Proposals (RFP) process to select a company to help with the installation and on-going operation of the camera systems; as per the city policy, the city went with the lowest tender and awarded the contract to Scott's Security Systems from Napanee, ON.

¹³ Quinte West is one of many Ontario municipalities which does not have its own municipal police service but instead contracts the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP).

In 2009, nine cameras were operational in the downtown. These cameras were financed through a reserve Police Service Board fund. The city operates a quasi-passively monitored system where camera footage is wirelessly transmitted to the OPP dispatch office and dispatchers can view and manipulate cameras in real-time if incidents arise. The camera system encountered performance issues early on, particularly with the reliability of the technology and the inability to expand the system due to the existing infrastructure. This resulted in Quinte West retaining a different IT company, Southeastern Telecommunication Services from Kingston, ON, in order to have higher quality images, better connectivity and to facilitate future expansion of the system (more below).

The city's camera policy was created by the city's CAO in conjunction with the Quinte West OPP, and was based off of the Ontario Information and Privacy Commissioner's *Guidelines* and London, Ontario's code of practice (Hier 2010: 227). Quinte West sought out London's policies in order to see a more detailed example of how to apply the IPC Guidelines in practice¹⁴. A review of Quinte West's Code of Practice indicates emphasis on particular points of the IPC *Guidelines* with respect to what cameras can view, how they will be operated and by whom, signage and other ways to notify the public (through brochures and website information), evaluations and audits of the system, and image retention and disclosure (e.g. for evidence). However, interview data indicate areas where common practice does not adhere to written policy. For example, Quinte West's policy on image retention states that images are stored for 72

¹⁴ While it is outside of the scope of this study to trace the policy diffusion of other cities (but see Hier (2010) for an in-depth analysis of the rise and spread of streetscape monitoring programs from 1981-2005, which includes a lengthy discussion of London's camera program), to be sure, policy learning and (to an extent) policy tourism elsewhere occurred prior to and concurrent with the learning/tourism which occurred with the cities in this study.

hours, but city officials stated that they are in fact stored for 90 days. There is no information on either the city's, or the Quinte West OPP's website regarding the camera system, and participants could not recall whether a public consultation was ever held about the cameras. The camera policy has not been revised or updated since its initial development, nor have there been any system evaluations or audits¹⁵. Indeed, the current Detachment Commander, Inspector Mike Reynolds (appointed in 2012 to replace Inspector Johns), has identified a need to review their policies after conversations with Orillia (who contacted Quinte West during the process of implementing their city's streetscape program) highlighted that some of their policies may not be up to date or in full compliance with the *IPC Guidelines*.

I did share our policy with the Orillia detachment 'cause they were in the start up mode so they'd taken [the policy] and they've built their own and gone through our risk management people. And we're going through an exercise right now to ensure that ours is up to date and current, so that's another component to make sure the checks and balances are being done [...] The current policy is certainly dated. So, we want to make sure it's current and up to date with all the Freedom of Information issues and checks and balances. I think they went to great extremes to ensure that people's freedoms and rights were all protected and certain areas where cameras could be put up, certain policy audits that had to be done and also within the old detachment, being sure that cameras were not set up in residential areas, facing into the window. So we're going through, because of Orillia detachment's inquires we've had to step up and look at our policies to make sure, as a new guy, are we current and [does] our policy fit today? (Inspector Reynolds)

Participants verbally emphasized what they felt were the most significant parts of their Code of Practice as being proper signage to identify the use of cameras to the public, making sure that cameras can only view public spaces and not residential areas, and that the monitoring of cameras is not abused so that personal privacy is compromised.

¹⁵ Under the current Inspector Mike Reynolds, no audits or evaluations have taken place since early 2012. It is unknown whether audits or evaluations occurred prior to 2012, though there are no records to indicate either took place.

Expansions to the Camera System

Additional cameras were added not long after the system first became operational: by the end of 2009, seventeen cameras were in use. The system has continued to grow, and currently operates twenty-nine cameras. The original installation covered most of downtown Trenton, and subsequent cameras have been installed to provide more robust coverage of the downtown areas as well as remote, troublesome locations (e.g. city parks where vandalism is known to occur). Participants attributed the growth of the system to the successes the cameras have been able to achieve, as well as the community support – monetary and otherwise – that backs the system. The public and business community have requested additional cameras, with the hope that the perceived successes of the original cameras will continue with any subsequent installations; for example, business owners in Frankford pushed for the installation of a camera in their downtown area for asset protection and to improve public safety. The funds supporting the system's expansion have come from a \$40,000 yearly budget provided by the city, intended for maintenance and growth of the system. This on-going funding has been significant to the expansion of Quinte West's camera system.

Despite the existence of annual earmarked funds for the camera system, this funding has been increasingly consumed by upgrades and maintenance costs, making it difficult to afford additional cameras. As such, the Quinte West OPP have twice sought grant funds from the Civil Remedies program to continue to expand their system, first in 2009 and second in 2012. Both grant applications have been successful and the OPP have received over \$50,000. The first grant funds were awarded in 2010, and they were used to

purchase a camera to monitor an Afghanistan repatriation memorial. Shortly after its installation, an act of vandalism took place but the camera did not get a clear view of the perpetrator; this event prompted the installation of a second camera at the site. The second grant went toward the purchase of three cameras to cover a “high risk” area near a high school and a Wal-Mart shopping centre. These funds were received in early 2013, and given under the conditions that the grant would be spent by March 31, 2013.

Each grant application outlined their anticipated use: the first to prevent and catch graffiti perpetrators, and the second to identify and prosecute youths involved with loitering-related incidents (assaults, mischief, drugs, trespassing). Other than addressing what the grants are intended for, the applications are virtually identical, the latter borrowing word-for-word from the first application with respect to demonstrating fulfillment of grant program criteria (for the prevention of unlawful activities), expected outcomes (cameras have had success and solved crimes in the community), and commitments to providing reports (purchase orders and detailed accounting for budget, providing “statistical analysis” through crime software to monitor evaluation and success of initiative). Indeed, emulating their first successful grant proved beneficial, and the police attributed their success in obtaining the grant to their ability to demonstrate that they satisfied the grant requirements – in particular, both applications explained that the cameras would enhance the existing system and would prevent unlawful activities and victimization through the use of (camera) technology. They also felt that asking for a smaller amount of money for additional cameras (as opposed to start-up costs) made them more likely to receive the funds.

We did hone in on the fact that, in respect to the, preventative nature because that's what the Civil Remedy grant was asking for, right? I guess

that's what you've gotta do is articulate what you're looking for and the reasons for it. I think it's difficult if the police services or the community is writing a grant to the Civil Remedies to start up a camera system because the costs are so prohibitive that they're not going to get enough. But we didn't ask for the moon when we did ours, we stipulate, we had the amounts, we had the quotes, we just had a full package and when they looked at it there was no real questions. A lot is that part of it; you gotta make sure you give them everything they're asking for and answer all those questions. The biggest thing that I found, as long as you have your quote and it's reasonable and it falls within the parameters of what it's for, and you can articulate that, then you've been successful (Police participant).

Interview data demonstrates that cameras have been primarily used to help with police investigations; thus, the decision to “hone in” on the preventative aspects of camera technology, as per the grant requirements, represents a desire to create proposals that conform to the grantors criteria. In other words, grant applications and proposals are tailored to fit the identified criteria in order to better their chances to receive the grant.

While grant funds were primarily sought to make up for the existing budget's inability to afford additional cameras, Inspector Reynolds also felt that obtaining grant funds was part of his due diligence to find any supplementary resources to help the community.

I think as a police service we need to make sure that we tap into every resource that we can get to help us be a better service. And to provide the community with what they expect from us. [...] When the city is providing considerable capital dollars to maintain the system, I think it's up to me to do my due diligence to look for other [Civil] Remedies to purchase cameras (Inspector Reynolds).

Reynolds felt a responsibility to source external funds to contribute to the system and bolster what was already in place. Sourcing money from grant programs means that police can avoid requesting funds for cameras from local organizations; this also enables police to request funds locally for other programs.

Mayor Williams is revitalizing the downtown core, it's considerable dollars and it's my job to ensure that we provide the support behind him in the policing world and make sure the community is safe and his assets are respected and mischief is kept to a minimum, and we do all those things. I think any policing leaders are trying to be smarter with their money but also look for grants. Civil Remedies is a great opportunity to look at specific projects that you want to do and we can always go to the Police Services Board with a proposal and we might get it, we might not, depending on the program. I'd certainly like to try the Civil Remedies component first. And then we can still tap into the Police Services Board for other things (Inspector Reynolds).

Because the majority of the camera funds are generated from the city, receiving the grant allowed police to contribute to the system's increasingly stifled growth. Obtaining grant funds also allows police to pursue projects both directly and indirectly: grants intended for specific projects are directly enabled, whereas other non-grant funded projects may be indirectly enabled as police no longer have to finance grant-funded projects themselves, therefore freeing up money for other potential uses.

Policy Learning and Tourism

Prior to his retirement, Inspector Johns acted as a strong advocate for surveillance camera technology, presenting at various association meetings, including the Ontario Association of Police Service Board Conference, as well as other cities' council meetings in support of cameras.

The inspector at the time, Earl Johns [...] was a major advocate of the system, he saw the benefits of a system that is in operation 24/7, and, would be a resource tool for the OPP to utilize (City participant).

I know that Inspector Johns has done a lot of presentations throughout the province. Mostly at the OPP level, at different detachments. A lot of OPP detachments are interested in the [grant] applications [...] So, we have a good reputation and the camera system that we put in, people are aware of

some of the stuff that we've done, so, and with the Inspector promoting it to the other municipalities, the word is getting out there (City participant).

Inspector John's promotional efforts established Quinte West as a wealth of information for other prospective cities. He presented on the camera technology, infrastructure and design in Quinte West, signage, privacy legislation, Quinte West's code of conduct, the purposes, goals, objectives and results of their system, and initial and upgrade/expansion costs. The Inspector strongly supported the use of cameras and advocated for their use across the region. In addition to the promotional work done by the Inspector, a number of cities have approached Quinte West to learn about their camera system.

We've been looked upon by other communities, the Niagara Regional Police were here a year ago, cause they had grant money to set up in St. Catharines, and they were looking at ten cameras there. And recently, with Orillia OPP they have the go-ahead to start off with ten cameras. Because of some of the significant issues that were happening downtown as well. So, they're looking towards us [...] We've gotten calls from Vancouver. We get phone calls, we get people that come and visit just to review them, different police services. Orillia's been around a couple of times.

Quinte West's "good reputation" concerning camera systems is due in part to Inspector John's entrepreneurship as well as the receptiveness and openness of the Quinte West OPP in receiving visits and providing information to prospective cities. Quinte West's camera program is well known not only regionally but also further afield; many prospective cities have engaged with Quinte West to learn about and emulate their successes (discussed further in the following chapters).

The Present System and Future Growth

Quinte West currently operates one of Ontario's largest camera systems – certainly the largest for a city of its size. Participants indicate that the system has been well

received within the community, and that the cameras have been used with success in assisting with incidents and as evidence for investigations. These claims have been made mostly on the basis of anecdotal evidence, as there has not been a specific evaluation of the camera system and its impact on crime (though general crime statistics are produced). These successes have been promoted locally as well as throughout the region (see above).

The system underwent a review in 2013 to ascertain their grid's capacity and capabilities. This provoked discussions about the limits of the system, not only technologically, but with respect to the ideological intentions of the system. As the downtown is now fully covered, subsequent installations have moved further outside of the downtown and future uses of cameras have begun to go beyond asset protection and security.

Now [the system] is being pushed into the west side, which not to argue that it's not needed there, but once we do that, then where do you stop from that point forward? Because right now you're taking it out of its original intended area and expanding it further into the city (City participant).

This prompted police to consider limits to the system with respect to where cameras should and should not be placed, and at which point monitoring becomes intrusive.

As we evaluate further issues in the community, then we will decide where we want to deploy cameras. We have to be very careful, obviously where we put these cameras, obviously for privacy reasons and issues, and we can't be focused in a residential area and that kind of stuff [...] But whether people know it or not, there's surveillance systems all over the place. I mean everyone is captured everyday. I don't know how many times you want to say, or captured both digital and both physically through surveillance cameras. So I think what we want to do is not be invasive but we want to make sure we provide a community that's safe and make smarter use of our limited resources. So, you look at the cameras systems that the UK have, beyond what we are, but we want to be careful that we are not intrusive but at the same time providing some good safety net for us and help us quicken our investigations by seeing things on the cameras (Police participant).

As of September 2013, however, the Quinte West Corporate Finance Committee is recommending another \$120,000 investment toward technology upgrades and additional cameras. Half of the needed funds will come from the Police Reserve fund (Sept 4, 2013 Council Minutes), and the remainder to be financed from the yearly budget.

Conclusion

Quinte West is the first city in this study to establish a camera system and has played an important role in the diffusion of information on streetscape camera systems, not only among these particular cities, but in the region as a whole. Subsequent discussions for each city will demonstrate what was learned from Quinte West and how it was applied in each local setting. Quinte West's camera policy selectively emphasizes – and enforces – particular aspects of privacy protection practices, and this varied interpretation and application can be seen with subsequent cities.

The analysis of the Quinte West data demonstrates that grants are also important to cities who have secured on-going funding. Participants feel that it is easier to obtain grant funds for system expansion as the request for additional funds is minimal relative to the initial funds required, and also because it is easier to fulfil grant criteria (e.g. easier to demonstrate the successes of an existing system). As systems grow, so do operating costs, and in this case, the yearly budget could no longer finance additional cameras. The grant has enabled the addition of four cameras to Quinte West's system as well as providing some relief to an increasingly tight camera budget.

Chapter 5

Successful Grant-funded Cities: Cornwall, Belleville and Cobourg

Introduction

This chapter discusses the other cities in this study that received grant funding: Cornwall, Belleville and Cobourg. The various influences of the CR and POC grant programs, as well as the effects of policy learning and tourism, are revealed through descriptions of each city's camera program history. Cornwall received two CR grants; the influence of the grants can be seen through their experiences with designing, implementing and operating their streetscape system, as well as how information learned from other cities is interpreted and applied. Belleville also demonstrates the grant influences; in particular, the influence of networking and policy learning/tourism among these cities. Belleville has not only learned important lessons from their predecessors in this study (Quinte West), but they have also served as a resource for subsequent cities (Peterborough and Orillia). Finally, Cobourg demonstrates some of the influences of the CR and POC programs, but also provides a clear example of how policy learning and tourism is a useful and pragmatic policymaking strategy, particularly for smaller cities. This chapter supports the arguments made concerning the various ways that the CR and POC program have influenced streetscape camera programs. It also shows the role of networking, policy learning and tourism in the process of designing, implementing and operating camera systems, as well as what is learned and how it is (selectively) interpreted and applied.

Cornwall

Introduction

The city of Cornwall's downtown camera system demonstrates a number of aspects of the three influences of the CR and POC programs. First, availability of the CR grant kick-started the system and the receipt of two grants from the CR program (for the initial installation and expansion of the system) made the system possible. The decision to pursue cameras was made easier due to the availability of grant funds, as local budgets would not be affected and participants felt comfortable using funds that came from the proceeds of criminal activity toward crime reduction in their community. Finally, additional resources were utilized to secure the grant and facilitate the system, including the help of a grant writer and the assistance of a number of community organizations.

The program is a police-led initiative despite the support given by local organizations, and the focus is primarily on addressing crime. In keeping with the grant criteria for crime prevention initiatives, the system is quasi-passively monitored as the Cornwall Police feel the real benefit of cameras is to deter criminal activity, and as such, less emphasis is put on crime detection or the investigative capabilities of cameras. The size and scope of Cornwall's system has been shaped by the amount of grant money received: in particular, the Ministry awarded the Cornwall Police approximately half of their requested funds for the expansion of their system, resulting in fewer cameras and a less comprehensive system than planned.

Finally, the Cornwall Police have engaged in networking and policy learning/tourism with other cities in order to learn about implementing and operating

camera technology and to create policies. The Cornwall Police were inspired to consider the use of cameras in their community after hearing about its application (and success) in Quinte West from Inspector Johns. Members of the Cornwall Police visited Quinte West over two days to learn about the operation of their system, and came back with negative lessons on what to avoid, and positive lessons on what to emulate. The Toronto Police were also consulted and together with Quinte West's policies and the *IPC Guidelines*, the Cornwall Police crafted their own policies to reflect their needs.

Camera Program Background and Beginnings

The city of Cornwall (approximate population 46,340 in 2011) (Statistics Canada 2011c) is located on the St. Lawrence River in eastern Ontario, roughly equidistant to both Montreal and Ottawa. Cornwall lies on the 49th parallel and is a port of entry, connecting the city to New York State. Because of its proximity to Quebec, the city is home to a large francophone population. A number of retail distribution centres are in the area and the city has a number of manufacturing, high-tech and food processing centres. In the summer, the city hosts a "Lift Off" festival, which draws a number of visitors to Cornwall's waterfront to watch hot air balloons and entertainment acts.

Cornwall's camera system was initiated by Police Chief Dan Parkinson in 2009. While studying at a police college in the United Kingdom in the early 2000s, Chief Parkinson became aware of the extensive use of cameras for crime prevention and investigation in Britain, prompting him to wonder what a similar application would look like in a Canadian setting. Years later, while attending a conference for the Ontario Association of Police Service Boards, the Chief became aware that cities in the region

were operating camera systems after hearing a presentation on Quinte West's experiences with streetscape camera surveillance, given by the then-Detachment Commander Earl Johns.

There was a Detachment Commander [Johns] who made a presentation at the Police Board Conference and I sat in on it. [Quinte West is] roughly the same size of us and [Johns] was praising the ability of this technology and I'm thinking to myself "well, if he got it, why can't we?" and that's when we decided to put in the application at the next opportunity to the Proceeds of Crime [grant]¹⁶. (Chief Parkinson).

Around the same time, Chief Parkinson became aware of the availability of provincial grant funds to purchase and install streetscape systems. He notified the Police Service Board, who then approved the recommendation to implement cameras. Participants indicated that having the funds supplied from elsewhere made it "easy" and "attractive" to consider, particularly as the funds came from the proceeds of criminal activity.

That it, the fact that, the fact there was funding for it, was not a cost to us, made it even more attractive to consider (PSB participant).

It makes it a lot easier for a Board too when it doesn't have to make an expenditure decision of its own. The money being supplied [...] from a source that, I mean I know it talks of taxpayer money, but proceeds from, from apprehension of other criminal activity, they devoted to prevention of criminal activity, makes a lot of sense to me (PSB participant).

I just see this as technology that's available to us. If we can afford it, it's certainly worth exploring, and taking money from the proceeds of crime pot funds makes us even more satisfied. You're taking money from people who have been criminals, or any money from crime and reinvesting it in technology that's supposed to help us deter, prevent, reduce crime (Police participant).

¹⁶ Participants sometimes confused or used the grant program names interchangeably; for example, participants would refer to the Civil Remedies as "Proceeds of Crime" to indicate the source of funding, rather than the program of the same name. The Civil Remedies program was also sometimes used as a catch-all, to refer to both programs at once.

Though crime in Cornwall was down overall, an analysis of crime statistics identified higher calls for service in the city's two downtown areas (Anglophone and Francophone). However, participants felt that there was no specific incident or on-going issues that had created a need for cameras, but rather the availability of funding provided an additional resource the city could benefit from.

There was never really no specific event that spurred our interest or brought this matter to the table, to be quite honest with you [...] to the best of my knowledge, it simply came out of an introduction from the Chief of Police, Chief Parkinson, that there was the possibility of some funding being made available for the purpose of introducing these surveillance systems into our community. So there wasn't, you know, a spike in crime or this kind of an event or events that were leading us to research what might be available out there. And that's why I can say in all sincerity, it wasn't, we weren't specifically looking for a new tool to deter crime. It sort of landed on the table as an 'here's an option, here's a potential tool' (PSB participant).

The Cornwall Police began talks with the Eastern Ontario Training Board (EOTB) to solicit their help in creating the grant application for the Civil Remedies program. The EOTB employed grant writers to create the proposal, acting as a project manager to gather information from all relevant parties (i.e. the grantors and Cornwall police) and package it into a format favourable to grant evaluators.

Grant writers are worth their weight in gold. It's a specialty, and we don't have that particular resource inside this organization. [Our staff] just don't know the ins and outs. Whether it's buzzwords or other things, people on the East Ontario Training Board who are experienced grant writers know how to play the game. They know the ins and the outs and what government listens to and what they don't, so it's to our advantage to have them play their experience and knowledge to grant writing (Police participant).

The grant application gave a description of the community profile, arguing that due to their proximity to Ottawa, Montreal, as well as the United States, Cornwall experienced a high rate of trafficking of controlled substances. The application stated that it fulfilled the

criteria for enhancing the technical ability to combat unlawful activity and reduce victimization as it would help deter crime and supplement policing needs in investigation criminal offenses in high crime business areas. The initiative's expected impact was to be another tool to fight increases in crime: specifically, to help consumers feel more secure, prevent opportunistic crime, deter waterfront smuggling, and deter crime in areas where prostitution and drug activity was known to occur, helping residents to feel safer. The application demonstrated its sustainability after the grant funding was over, promising to produce and maintain fact sheets, community protocol and privacy guidelines; the application also promised to produce a manual based on best practices after the first year of operation and to provide proper training on the camera technology. Finally, the application promised a commitment to producing reports by stating it would "adhere to the reporting structure set out by the Ministry" (applicants did not have previous examples of what the reporting would look like, however). In addition to the application, the Cornwall police and ETOB included a detailed twelve month work plan which showed activities, outputs, outcomes and identifying those responsible for each task. They also included crime statistics for the previous two years, as well as a budget and information on the camera technology to be implemented.

Similar to Quinte West, the application argued that the initiative would address unlawful activity through detection and deterrence, arguing that Cornwall's strategic location made it a hotspot for trafficking activity. Also, the inclusion of a detailed twelve-month work plan as well as comprehensive information on their proposed system was intended to demonstrate to grantors that they had carefully thought out and planned their

proposed initiative. Grantors would be able to see how the cameras would be successfully implemented within the allotted timeframe.

Implementing the Camera System and Policy Creation

The Cornwall Police felt that having a grant writer dedicated to the project was invaluable to their application, as they were ultimately successful in receiving a \$100,597 grant in 2010. This enabled the installation of six quasi-passively-monitored cameras¹⁷ in their two downtown areas. While the grant funded the purchase and installation of the camera equipment, the Cornwall Police have relied on partnerships with organizations in the city to operate their camera system; partnerships have been established with Cornwall Electric, City of Cornwall, Downtown Business Associations and the Cornwall Housing Authority. Rather than a financial contribution, however, these organizations have given contributions in kind (e.g. Cornwall Electric providing electricity for free).

We were looking for any kind of support for this, we recognized that I think that, \$90,000 was barely enough to even get the first six installations up and running so we had a lot of in kind support from the city. There were four or five entities that basically stepped forward and helped us (Police participant).

Participants felt it was easier to ask for assistance and contributions from community organizations once they had money secured for the camera project.

See, it's a lot easier to approach your community members or stores or business people if you have a money base to start with. You say 'we have this, can you help us?' (Police participant).

After receiving grant money, the Cornwall Police engaged in policy learning and tourism to learn about camera technology and privacy protection. Members of the

¹⁷ Cameras have the ability to be manipulated, and camera feed can be viewed in real-time at the police station's communication centre.

Cornwall Police visited Quinte West to learn about their camera system, bringing back both positive and negative lessons of what to emulate and what to avoid.

They came back with observations, some that were mildly critical of how [the cameras] had been deployed in Quinte West, and some saying ‘yeah, it looks like something we should do here’ (Police participant).

In particular, their experiences with Quinte West indicated a need for different technology to assure that the system would remain operational if individual cameras experienced problems.

We ended up going to Quinte West where the OPP have a system that was set up but the technology that was used over there is completely different [than ours]. So, their system meant that if one camera went down, the whole system went down, so it was more of a series type of system rather than one on one. Our cameras can communicate with the main headquarters here one on one. So, if one camera goes down we can still operate the rest of the cameras (Police participant).

Cornwall’s camera policy is influenced by information learned from Quinte West, as well as Toronto and Ontario *IPC Guidelines*. Participants emphasized that they borrowed from available policies, and tailored their own to reflect what they needed within their own community.

So, as far as the directives and policy we didn't reinvent the wheel, we went with what Toronto had and [the Quinte West] OPP and started from there. So how can we make it work for us? And we did, we developed a process and it's working well so far (Police participant).

The Cornwall Police also contacted the Ontario IPC office to receive information and guidance on how to implement and operate camera systems while remaining in compliance with privacy legislation. Police participants felt it was in their best interest to comply as best possible with the *Guidelines*, but did not seek final approval of their policies.

There was actually published material from the Office of the Privacy Commissioner with respect to the, the rules basically and we followed those as closely as we could. We were mindful of it, it's just an extra hassle of doing something like this only to be stonewalled or stymied by the Privacy Commissioner after you've done all this work, it's a wasted effort so you're better off making sure you're following the rules as closely as you can before embarking on something like this [...] We didn't go for approval, no. We felt that we squarely fit within the rules that had been established. We don't need to get their approval, we want to play nice with them, but we don't necessarily need their approval (Police participant).

While the Cornwall Police feel they are in compliance with the *Guidelines*, examination of their policies indicates selective emphasis and generous interpretations: for example, the IPC *Guidelines* recommend a 72 hour image-retention period, whereas the Cornwall Police can retain images for up to eight months (previously six months) to remain within a statute of limitations.

We have just gone to eight months from six. We've extended it because what we've found is, we have a complaints process here that has a statute of limitations on when they can be started and we found that there's some that just fall outside that sixth month range and we just wanted to be a little more comfortable (Police participant).

Cornwall's policy focuses a great deal on the proper use of the camera system to assure against any potential abuses. Participants also verbally emphasized the importance of properly educating staff on how the cameras are used, by whom, when, how this is documented and what to do when inappropriate disclosures occur.

Contrary to most of the camera programs in this study, the intended primary purpose of the camera system was to act as a deterrent; while the Cornwall Police anticipated using camera images to assist with investigations, participants advocated quite strongly for the camera's preventative capabilities over and above its ability to assist after the fact. The Cornwall Police felt that cameras were a good crime prevention tool, and thus fit within the grant specifications for crime prevention initiatives. On-going

promotion and notification of the cameras and their successes is a key part of the deterrence strategy. To this end, three public consultations were held – one in French and two in English – to inform the community about the incoming cameras and to ask for feedback. Interviews were also given on local radio, and media releases provided to local newspapers. There is also information, frequently asked questions and pamphlets on the Cornwall Police Service’s website.

Evaluations and Expansions to the System

Evaluations of the camera system have produced mixed results. Cornwall police intended to conduct a survey of community members’ perceptions of the cameras and their influence on crime and safety. This survey was to be carried out by representatives from a policing course through the local college; due to staff illness, however, the survey was not conducted. While reporting requirements of the grant program require recipients to provide information on the final evaluation of the program, Cornwall was only able to predict “the overall objective will be met”, based on the positive feedback from the community and business partners; thus, not only were the reporting promises vague (Cornwall “will adhere to the reporting structure set out by the Ministry”), but so too were the actual reporting outcomes, both which were accepted by the Ministry. The Cornwall Police have examined crime rates before and after the installation of cameras, and they have indicated that cameras have had a limited impact and mixed results.

We've gone back and measured with limited success in trying to convince ourselves that these have actually had a benefit, but we can certainly see in types of categories of calls for service, there has been a decline. Others, where you think there would have been, have not demonstrated that same sort of decline (Police participant).

Police participants felt that the limited successes and mixed results were due to “blind spots” in their current system; they felt that a more comprehensive and robust system with more cameras would fill in those blind spots and be able to capture what the existing cameras have been unable to. As a result, the Cornwall Police submitted a second application to the Civil Remedies program to expand their system further.

So, we actually have made a second application to increase the number of cameras because we felt we really couldn't do much with the six that we have. We have gaps in coverage, the technology will only allow you to, to take into view so much, and we wanna fill in those gaps to further reinforce what we think we've been able to do with that, is just act as a deterrent. We haven't used the cameras with any success in solving crime, it's somewhat frustrating, and this is why we feel the need to go out and expand the number of cameras. There's certain instances, have happened, and we find ourselves saying 'well great the cameras are there, but they're pointing in the wrong direction' or the cycle wasn't quite right [...] So we, again, we haven't used the cameras to any extent when it comes to solving crime (Police participant).

Despite the IPC *Guidelines* recommending that camera policy be reviewed if there are changes to camera surveillance systems, the expansions to the system are considered “an operational decision” (PSB participant) and the Cornwall Police did not seek approval from the Police Service Board. The Cornwall Police decided to create the more recent application themselves rather than utilizing the help of a grant writer again, as they felt they could demonstrate both their successes and their continued need based on their original application and the experiences they have had since their program has been in operation.

I based my information as far as the areas of concern were based on my original, our original application that we got the original six cameras. What I also did was I compiled the stats for those two [downtown] areas. I compared the previous stats to the current stats and showed the difference and I articulated in my report how we came to that conclusion and the positive effect in our, we think, or the deterrent effect that it has had on the level of crime (Police participant).

We went with the same approach saying we're still targeting those two areas because there were some dead spots, so we want to provide better coverage but as well we wanted to expand, to go into areas that we know are areas of concern, but that they haven't been identified perhaps in the first grant application [...] We had to establish there was an issue there. There was a crime issue we needed to address and how we're gonna address it and our address, the way we address it is through the camera, through the installation of cameras (Police participant).

Indeed, the subsequent application was largely modeled off of the initial application, borrowing heavily in content with regard to the community profile and identified need, demonstrating fulfilment of grant program criteria (to combat unlawful activity and reduce victimization), the initiative's expected impact, its sustainability post-grant funding and reporting commitments. The more recent application had more references to crime statistics, in particular how crime rates had been affected with the introduction of the initial streetscape cameras. Cameras were presented as having a positive effect on crime in four out of eighteen areas, no effect on eleven areas, and no mention of the other three areas (presumably these were increases, though the only explanation given for reported increases in the context of cameras was due to the community being more apt to report crimes if they felt they might be caught on camera). The application thus attempted to balance the desire to show the successes of cameras (therefore warranting additional cameras to continue this success) alongside demonstrating a need for other cameras due to persisting issues in the community (thereby indicating that cameras had not been entirely successful). The application again included detailed crime statistics appendix as well as a comprehensive quote.

The second application asked for funding to purchase and install thirteen additional cameras and one re-deployable camera; however, representatives from the Civil

Remedies program had asked the enhancement project to be scaled back to six cameras, limiting the size of their expansion.

We applied for 13 more cameras. Go big or go home y'know. We heard back actually from Civil Remedies and they want to, they asked us if we could scale it back to six cameras, so we said of course we would (Police participant).

In July 2013, it was announced that the Cornwall Police had been awarded \$147,112.

Participants expressed that the grants were instrumental for them to establish a camera system: they felt they would not be able to source the money from local organizations, and thus, a camera system would not be possible without grant funds.

We would not have the program [without the grant]. We are not the best resourced small or mid-sized community in Ontario. The costs of living here is low and hence the tax base is small. For an item like this, for closed circuit television project, for me to convince our board and council that this was a necessary expenditure I think would have been a very difficult thing to do. Despite being able to demonstrate the proof that perhaps some of the research indicates it's effective and it works, when it comes down to budget dollars here, arguments like that don't necessarily win the day. So no, in short answer, no we wouldn't have the CCTV project had the grant money not been available (Police participant).

Cornwall has recently been visited by Barrie, a city in the region who was interested in learning about their camera program. The Cornwall Police gave advice on camera technology and implementation.

The city of Barrie [has visited]. Actually the Police Chief came down and did a site visit to see what we had as far as an installation was concerned and I believe that that's the only main one that I can recall. But he actually took the trip down here and we provided him with all the details including all the different and the other companies that provided proposals and who we went with and why we went with [them]. My IT manager discussed technology and the difference in technology (Police participant).

Thus, Cornwall has not only learned from other cities in developing their own camera program, but they have begun to advise subsequent cities who are looking to do the same.

There is the potential that Cornwall will continue to advise neighbouring cities about their camera program as well as the CR/POC grants, particularly as they have demonstrated success in obtaining two provincial grants.

Conclusion

Cornwall's experience with establishing and operating a CR-funded camera system demonstrates examples of the ways that provincial grant programs can influence streetscape camera systems. Grants were instrumental to this community's ability to establish a camera system, but the help of community organizations was also vital to the camera program. Without both the grant funds and the in-kind support provided by local organizations, this camera system would have struggled to come to fruition. This shows that while grant funds can significantly affect whether camera systems are implemented, community organizations are still important. Indeed, in their final outcomes report for their first grant, the Cornwall Police stated that the camera program created community partnerships through their joint efforts to reduce crime.

The Cornwall Police not only networked with organizations in their own community, but also with Quinte West, engaging in policy tourism in order to learn about camera technology, system design and privacy protection policy. This resulted in determining the type of cameras used and the kind of system Cornwall operates, as well as influencing some aspects of Cornwall's camera policy. Quinte West's policies, along with Toronto's and the *IPC Guidelines* were used to create Cornwall's policy. While Cornwall's camera policy shares some similarities – for example, mirroring Quinte West's general concern over the proper use of camera systems – they also interpret and

selectively emphasize different aspects of the *IPC Guidelines*. Cornwall's interpretation of image retention is even more generous than their predecessor, and places much greater emphasis on the importance of public awareness. Thus, Cornwall appears to have applied those negative lessons learned from Quinte West toward designing and implementing a system that would be a reliable, and selectively adopted aspects of Quinte West's privacy protection policy, as they had their own interpretations and understandings of how to apply the *IPC Guidelines*.

Belleville

Introduction

The city of Belleville plays an important role in the diffusion of information on streetscape camera systems and the CR grant. When creating their camera program, Belleville was reliant on the information provided by neighbouring Quinte West concerning camera technology, design, implementation and privacy policy. Belleville has since become an important resource for other cities looking to establish a camera program; Barrie, Peterborough and Orillia have all engaged with Belleville to learn about their system and their policies, but also to learn from their successful grant application. Thus, Belleville has transitioned from being a learner to a teacher, passing down the information gained from their previous engagement with Quinte West, but also through their own experiences. Like Cornwall, Belleville learned both positive and negative lessons from Quinte West with respect to camera technology; their desire to avoid a low cost/low quality system drove Belleville to push for additional community funds.

Belleville also learned from Quinte West's camera policies, however here too we see selective attention to particular aspects of the *IPC Guidelines* alongside a general concern over privacy protection.

Belleville also differs in their approach to using grant funds for future expansions to their system. Unlike Quinte West and Cornwall who have pursued grants for expansions, Belleville feels that grant applications for cameras have lower success rates as cameras are no longer a "new" initiative. As the CR and POC grants fund other initiatives, Belleville participants indicate they would rather utilize the grants for other programs they feel may have more success in getting funded.

Camera Program Background and Beginnings

Belleville is a mid-sized city (approximate population 49,454 in 2011) (Statistics Canada 2011a) located along the Quebec-Windsor corridor and on the Bay of Quinte in southeast Ontario. 8 Wing/CFB Trenton is 8 km to the east in the neighbouring city of Quinte West, and a number of secondary and tertiary industries operate in Belleville which support the base. Many Canadian Forces personnel reside in Belleville as well. The city is also home to a number of large commercial and manufacturing companies.

Belleville's camera program was initiated by the then-newly appointed Chief of Police, Cory McMullan, in 2009. One of her first actions as Chief was to conduct an organizational review to identify areas of concern in the community and how best to address them. Issues in the downtown included vandalism, rowdyism, property crime, and drug use. The perception of safety downtown was also identified as a key concern among residents.

Chief McMullan was aware of the use of cameras in other communities to address these concerns, as well as their use as an investigative tool for police. The Chief visited the neighbouring community of Quinte West to learn about their system and its operation, and came back with information and advice on how to go about implementing a similar system in Belleville.

So I went out and visited Quinte West and looked at their system and came back. Obviously funding and sustainability and being fiscally responsible becomes an issue at the same time, and especially looking at what had happened with Quinte West, going for the least expensive product was not the best route, and we wanted to make sure it was long term and sustainable project as well as meeting all the legislation (Chief McMullan).

A major take away was that cost-effectiveness was key to ensuring a long-term sustainable system: inexpensive (and thus unreliable) technology was not desired. As such, the Chief knew considerable dollars would be needed for a dependable system to cover their downtown.

Chief McMullan was aware of the availability of provincial grant money from the Civil Remedies program, but also sought out partnerships to bring the program to fruition. Funding contributions from community organizations were solicited as it was unknown how much money would be received through the grant, if any. In the event that they were unsuccessful in receiving grant funds, these community contributions would then serve as a contingency fund. Since the police were unable to contribute from their own budget, community contributions were essential to assure the success of the system. Participants also felt that financial contributions from local organizations demonstrated strong community support to grantors, therefore increasing their chances of success. The Chief initiated talks with the Belleville DBIA, who were already interested in the use of

cameras for the downtown, and they agreed to partner with the Belleville Police Service (BPS), committing \$50,000 to the project in addition to any grant money received – or as contingency funding in the event that they were unsuccessful.

There had been some discussion with the Downtown Business Association, ‘hey it would be nice to have cameras’ and it had sort of... nothing was done and it was dropped off the table and kind of went silent. And when I came, I started having discussions [about cameras] when I went to the DBIA meetings. I brought [cameras] up at a monthly meeting and did the research and, yes we could have a potential grant. And once I did that research and when you're applying for grants, partnerships are key in being successful so I went back to them and said ‘would they provide a letter of support and consider some kind of financial commitment’ cause that shows even more support as far as, it's easy to write a letter saying it's a great idea but if they're willing to provide money... So I went to the DBIA and they said yes [they would commit money]. We put in a grant application [...] and there was a discussion that these cameras are going to benefit the downtown so yes there should be a commitment from [the city]. And they asked about me putting it into the police budget, and I said at that point because of the pressures on policing that it wouldn't be my top priority to put it into the police budget and that the chances of getting it approved in the police budget... I couldn't guarantee that (Chief McMullan).

The DBIA's financial commitment was specified in the grant application and after it was submitted, the BPS and DBIA approached the city to ask for support. The City of Belleville agreed to contribute \$75,000, again, to bolster any funds received from the grant program or to facilitate the project if unsuccessful. Despite these significant contributions from other organizations, the police remained the sole holders of the initiative as the grant was only available to police agencies, and due to the liabilities involved with streetscape monitoring.

The police service is the one that put the push on to get the cameras and basically we were the holder of the initiative, we were the ones that got the grant, and we have obviously because of Freedom of Information, a lot of other things, [we have] control over it to make sure there weren't breaches of information going out, that there isn't abuse of the system, and with any future expansions, it would be the same as the [original installation] (Police participant).

To create the grant application, the BPS hired a consultant (paid for by the DBIA) who helped put together particulars on crime statistics, hot spots and city demographics to identify where cameras were most needed.

We provided our consultant's report as far as the hotspots in the area, downtown. We provided information from the DBIA and their letter of support and what they had found. We didn't provide a letter from the city because we already applied. I think we said we'd partner with the city because I had talked to some of the local council and they were in support of the initiative so that yes, we were working with them. The information from the Freedom of Information and how we would be compliant with that and how we were working with [the OIPC]. And our crime stats, and that consultant's report were a huge piece of our application [...] showing where the hotspots were in the downtown. And as I said, I did the research ahead of time as far as what other communities had done and what happened in other countries and we had specific aims and goals as far as acting as a deterrent, helping with investigations and just the perception [of safety] (Police participant).

The application proposed to implement fifteen cameras in the downtown area to deal with "quality-of-life" problems in the downtown, including panhandling, vandalism, and drug trafficking, as well as "more serious crimes" of assault, robbery, and homicide. Despite undergoing revitalization, the downtown still suffers from a negative reputation of being unsafe and the cameras are a measure to correct this. The application explained that financial support had been secured from the city's DBIA, and that the city had "agreed to discuss on-going support of the program". Grant criteria were demonstrated by outlining crime instances in the downtown, and that the cameras would assist victims and prevent victimization by installing an effective deterrent which would be publicized to potential violators. The expected impact would be a reduction in unlawful activities and an increased perception of safety. The application promised to produce financial reports to verify costs, and that the DBIA would conduct on-going surveys to determine the impact

on businesses and residents. The application also included crime statistics of the downtown, a letter of support (stating the financial commitment) from the DBIA, a detailed budget, quotes and information on camera technology.

Belleville's application not only focused on criminal activities, but also anti-social behaviours, and attributed both to community members feeling unsafe. Thus, supported by crime statistics which reflected their claims about unwanted behaviour downtown, cameras would be installed in these areas. The application and supporting documentation provided also made it clear that there was significant support in the community, financial and otherwise, that was meant to show the grantors that the program would be successful. The Chief felt that the information that was provided demonstrated to the grantors that they had done their "homework", and increased their chances of receiving the grant. Additionally, it was felt that doing the legwork up front was a positive practice for implementing new initiatives in general.

Basically doing your homework right from the very beginning, when they see that you've done your homework, you have a thorough knowledge of what you want to put forward. It's easier to get funding than if you go forward and [say] 'well, we haven't looked into that'. When you have all that information up front people tend to say 'oh ok' and they can already see 'oh well this is going to be successful one way or another' we're gonna be successful, well then they want to be part of it. [...] Its very valuable because when you start getting into that mindset that, ok you're gonna have to provide all the details for your initiative, how you're gonna implement and then how you're gonna evaluate it, that's something in policing that for any program whether its additional staff, whether it's a technology program, whether it's a new way to investigate, those are the principles that we should be looking at (Police participant).

In other words, it was felt that compiling the information to satisfy the grant application helped to assure the success of not only the grant, but the camera system itself.

Implementing the Camera System and Policy Creation

The Belleville Police were notified in mid-2010 that their grant application for \$183,000 was successful. With supports in place from both the DBIA and the city, they were assured enough funds to implement a comprehensive and reliable camera system. A camera committee was formed with members from the DBIA, Police Service Board, Belleville Police and city council to create a Request for Proposals for the installation company. In the spring of 2011, fifteen cameras, including two re-deployable cameras, were fully operational.

Belleville police drew on information received from Quinte West as well as the *IPC Guidelines* when drafting their camera policy. The Ontario IPC office was contacted to gather the relevant information on privacy legislation and how they could design their camera program to be in compliance. Many of the major concerns centered around proper use of the system.

[We worked] with [the OIPC] as far as where you position the cameras and views they can and can't have, who has access to the monitoring, and how we can make sure that we ensure that other people don't have access to that. For instance one of the things that came out is the, the cameras can't be utilized [for the wrong reasons] because we have control here in the station, we're just interested in what Mike is doing downtown and we're just following him along to see and oh he's meeting up with so and so. That isn't the purpose of it and that we're monitoring the use of those cameras and if they're moved that they're moved for the right reasons (Police participant).

While in some cases participants felt the *Guidelines* were straightforward, they also recognized the vagueness of some recommendations and the inherent interpretations. Image retention was a source of deliberation, depending on the resource requirements of Freedom of Information requests, whereas they felt the information required on signs to be straightforward.

I mean there's always going to be some vagueness and there's always going to be some room for interpretation and you'd rather error on the side of safety than go to the other side. [...] I think one of the key things that we were looking is how long can we keep [images] for? What do we need it for? And, I think, one of the contributing factors is you wanna make sure you keep it long enough that it is available for investigations, but you also don't want to open up the door because the redaction of videos, if there are Freedom of Information requests [...] I didn't want to dedicate staff hours because somebody can put it in a request for really other than no other purpose than to tie up resources so we wanted to make sure we only kept it as long as we needed to and I would say that was really the only part that we sat and laboured over to a certain extent. [...] We got some pretty good, pretty solid information as far as this is what you have to do. For instance, with the signs it was very clear you have to have ABCDEF and G. The signs that we have obviously have to have the by law, contact information, the phone number and a name, so they're very, very specific (Police participant).

In compliance with the *Guidelines*, a public consultation was also held, where participants indicated that those in attendance were supportive of the initiative. This public meeting was also a venue to assure the community that their privacy rights would be protected, and that the system would be used appropriately.

The reception when we did the public consultation, we had a meeting downtown 'cause that's where they were going, and we had very low attendance and everybody that was there wanted more cameras and wanted cameras in their area. We anticipated the potential of some concerns of Freedom of Information and that's why we worked with the government there as far as 'what's the legislation and what did we have to do to meet [it]?' So we were well prepared for the consultations and any individuals who came forward... And I think we had one question or concern, you know "I've got an apartment down town... are these cameras [going to see in]?" No, we're not putting these cameras into individual residences. We're not going to do that nor can we do that, that's not the purpose for them. So it was overall very well received right from when we started the process and getting input as to whether this is something that would benefit Belleville and something that the community wanted. Overall, the reception was excellent right from when we first brought it forward (Police participant).

The Present System and Future Growth

The Belleville Police operate a quasi-passively-monitored system; like Quinte West and Cornwall, the equipment is located in an area of the police facility where staff can utilize cameras if there is an on-going incident. Police report that the camera footage has been utilized often, and participants indicated a number of incidents where the cameras have assisted investigations. Participants felt the camera program had been an overwhelming success; however this conclusion was based largely off of a number of anecdotal reports, and participants indicated difficulties demonstrating the preventative aspect of cameras.

I mean and we had all kinds of newspaper articles and commentary from individuals about they were feeling safer and these were the crimes that up to this point we had been able to solve as far as investigative. We obviously felt that it was crime prevention and that there is [prevention], but could we say absolutely? No we, we couldn't provide that information to the Ministry. It's very difficult for a police service to show statistically, we've prevented these crimes. It's just very difficult because you can say there is a decrease in crime and it was right after we put the cameras up. But did it have anything to do with the cameras? How can we get into the minds of the individuals and know who was going to community those crimes but decided not to? (Police participant).

Further, the Chief remarked that given the large amount of positive reception from the community, it would not be worth trying to confirm what they already felt to be true, that cameras had worked and been a benefit.

We haven't done, we haven't specifically asked out and done a survey 'do you feel safer 'cause the cameras are downtown?' We've done it more informally in talking with business owners and people who frequent the downtown, talking to the DBIA [...] I really feel at this point, we know that, we haven't had anybody complaining about the cameras being down there, we've had no negativity and anybody you talk to it's definitely been a positive response. [...] we haven't had any negativity so [there is no point] for me to waste resources [asking] 'so what do you think of the cameras?' (Chief McMullan).

The Final Evaluation report given to the Ministry on the outcomes of the initiative states that the perception of safety has been enhanced (based on comments from merchants that customers commented on feeling safe and that they were returning to shop in the downtown), and initial feedback had been positive. It also stated that the initiative had been well promoted, through media releases, newspaper articles, and information on the Belleville police website and that “specific information and statistics will be reviewed on an on-going basis”.

The initial camera purchase and installation was funded by the Civil Remedies grant and city contributions, and subsequent upgrades and camera purchases have come from DBIA funds. Since the initial installation, two additional cameras have been installed in the north and south ends of the city. Subsequent enhancements to the system will come from funds sourced locally: participants indicated they felt future grants would not be awarded for cameras because they were no longer a “new” initiative, and did not want to jeopardize other programs that may have a chance at being successful.

Grant applications tend to be more successful with new initiatives as oppose to expanding current initiatives unless you're expanding it in different ways. But just to add cameras? I don't know if we'd be successful and I don't want to risk jeopardizing a grant for another program (Police participant).

Participants felt that enhancements were easier to fund locally as the asking amount was far less than the money needed for the initial set up costs.

If the police were to come to us, or the DBIA and said ‘look, we feel we need an extra three or four or two cameras, this is the cost of the cameras, would the city be willing to look at some funding?’ Probably, we would be quite happy to entertain that, where we would get the funds from? Whether it would come out of another budget [...] the initial purchase was the big one. And installation and so on and so forth (City participant).

Indeed, participants emphasized that the initial grant was significant to getting the program off the ground. Many remarked that without the grant, they would not have the system they do today.

The grant money was the number one, and when they found the grant money was available that's where the camera issue really came to light, when they found out that they could apply for this kind of money, then they got serious about the cameras. So, if that camera grant money had never been available, this project may have never got off the ground (City participant).

Without that provincial funding we would have had a much smaller, not as effective system in place (Police participant).

Thus, despite having considerable funds sourced locally from both the DBIA and the city, the grant instigated the system and enabled a reliable and comprehensive system.

Many neighbouring communities in the region, such as Barrie, Orillia and Peterborough, have contacted and visited Belleville to learn about their camera system and their grant application.

We've had Peterborough, Barrie, Orillia contacting us asking us for our grant applications and our procedures. [...] We referred them to my IT Sergeant, they've asked for copies of my grant and our RFP. I believe it was Orillia who came down here and I was very impressed because they had [Police Service] Board members as well as city staff and city council members that came down for the meeting and what we did was we had myself and our IT Sergeant as well as a member from the company that [installed the cameras], and [Orillia] had all kinds of questions. One of the key things they said was that they didn't have [...] the calls for service information because people weren't always reporting. So I said you know, one of the things you do is if you get all of the calls for service then you show the need for the cameras [...] I was impressed with the representation and I mean Orillia isn't really [nearby]¹⁸, but the representation they had in coming down to get the information, so obviously when you have a group like that coming down you want to provide them with anything and everything that we possibly can (Police participant).

¹⁸ Orillia is approximately 240km away from Belleville.

Belleville police provided policy documents and grant applications, and coached Orillia in particular on what to provide in future grant applications to show a sufficient need for cameras. Belleville also expressed a feeling of obligation to provide as much information as possible to cities who visit, particularly so if those cities come from further away.

Conclusion

Belleville presents a strong example of the diffusion process of CR and POC-funded camera systems. Not only did they learn and apply information gained from neighbouring Quinte West, but Belleville has since become an important resource to other cities in the region who want to learn about implementing camera systems, particularly through the use of provincial grant funds. Chief McMullan is seen as a strong advocate for cameras in the region, in many ways reminiscent of the role that Earl Johns of Quinte West formerly held.

The lessons learned from Quinte West's system drove Belleville to drum up more financial support from within the local community to assure that they would have a reliable and comprehensive camera system. Like Cornwall, this example shows that local organizations do not become obsolete in the implementation of grant-funded camera programs. While it was the case that community organizations had wanted cameras prior to Chief McMullan's arrival, the program did not gain any traction until the CR grant funding was identified and pursued by the police. Thus, community partners play an important role in facilitating the implementation and operation of camera programs, and the police are the drivers of the program. The successful fundraising and receipt of the grant also suggests that funding can beget more funding; participants not only felt that

their local contributions in some ways contributed to receiving the grant, as they demonstrated support for the program instrumentally (as opposed to just rhetorically), but also that additional funds become easier to secure when there are already-existing financial commitments in place. Indeed, despite the decision to not pursue grants for future expansions, it was felt that securing the funds locally would be made considerably easier due to the significant contributions already made; obtaining additional funds is less of an undertaking when considerable financial support has already been put in place.

Belleville also learned from Quinte West's camera policies, though similar to Cornwall, they have their own interpretations and understandings of how to apply the *IPC Guidelines*. Image retention was deliberated by the Belleville Police, despite the IPC's recommendation of a 48-72 hour retention period, whereas they felt that the recommendations for signage to be very specific and non-negotiable. What is common with Quinte West and Cornwall, however, is the general concern over privacy protection; Belleville was particularly concerned over proper use of the system (i.e. not abusing the cameras for personal use) and viewing only public areas.

Cobourg

Introduction

Cobourg is the smallest community in this study, and also operates the smallest camera program with just two cameras. Cobourg is unique in that it is the only community to not engage with any other city in this study. Instead, Cobourg engaged in policy learning with nearby Toronto. Toronto operates the province's largest camera

system, and Cobourg benefitted from the comparably vast resources available to the Toronto police; Cobourg felt it was pragmatic to borrow policies from Toronto's established system as they had been vetted by staff with more resources and specific expertise.

Cobourg also presents a clear example of how the timelines of the grant programs can influence the implementation of a camera program. Due to issues with the company charged with camera installation, Cobourg risked going over the spending deadline. Ministry representatives requested a revised work plan and for Cobourg Police to put pressure on the installation company, otherwise the funds would have been remitted for use in the next fiscal year and Cobourg may have risked forfeiting the grant.

Camera Program Background and Beginnings

Cobourg (approximate population 18,519 in 2011) (Statistics Canada 2011b) is a town located on Lake Ontario in southern Ontario. Cobourg is the largest town in Northumberland County, bringing residents from neighbouring communities to the city for work, recreation and administrative needs. In the summer months, Cobourg's beaches are visited by a large number of people from cities in the area, including Toronto 95km to the east.

Cobourg's camera program was initiated in 2009 by the then-Chief of the Cobourg Police Service (CPS), Paul Sweet. Cobourg was experiencing issues with drugs and anti-social behaviour among youths in the downtown area, and it was hoped that the cameras would deter some of the activity and make residents, particularly the elderly, feel safer in coming downtown.

I think it was that we have, like any town in Ontario or any town in Canada, we have our drug situation and anything else that we can't have, no matter how many officers we have we wouldn't have them downtown in the downtown core 365 days a year 24 hours around the clock so it's easy to have more of a reactive measure against to have those camera in place for when a crime does occur down there and it was the feeling that it still deters people from creating that activity in the downtown core, granted it may move it somewhere else, but downtown was where we're having the issue. Obviously you get people that don't want to shop downtown when there's certain types of dealings going on down there and if they, if it makes them feel better that they're there, the better for us (Police participant).

While the police noted these issues were not new or increasing, they nevertheless wanted to provide a measure to have a presence in the downtown as they could not be there 24/7. Chief Sweet became aware of the Civil Remedies program which had funded other camera programs in the region and was interested in their use for the city.

[The camera program began in] 2009 I believe it was, and that was about the same time [as] the grant process. They're published, we could see which grants were available and obviously there's a criteria that has been made to get that funding. And in 2009 the Chief saw the Civil Remedies and had spoken about the possibility of cameras downtown and put an application I guess you would say, before the Ministry (Police participant).

The Chief prepared a report for to the Police Service Board (PSB), notifying them of the proposed camera initiative as well as the possibility of the purchase and installation of cameras being funded by the CR grant. The PSB approved the proposal and the grant application was created.

The application proposed a two-camera portable (re-deployable) system that could be deployed to identified crime hot spots and to use for large public events for crowd safety. The system would be high profile in order to act as a deterrent, and would provide a sense of safety to the senior population in Cobourg. The application also noted that the system would be the same product and would use the same vendor as that which is used successfully by the Toronto Police. The application demonstrated the fulfillment of

criteria by stating that the initiative addresses unlawful activity and prevents victimization, and again references its effectiveness as a valuable tool in Toronto. The Cobourg police stated a commitment to “providing reports and information as requested”. Cobourg police also included a budget as well as a detailed quote and information on the camera technology. Toronto’s camera system was referenced multiple times, with Cobourg promising to emulate as much as possible (using the same kind of system, the same vendors, etc.), as a way to guarantee the success of their own system to grantors. Similar to the other cities’ applications, they also provided additional, detailed information to show grantors that they would have a well-planned and therefore well-executed camera program.

Prior to receiving the grant, Chief Sweet and other representatives of the CPS visited the Toronto Police to learn about their camera system and how their camera policy complied with the *IPC Guidelines*. The CPS also notified the Ontario IPC office of their intent to install a camera system and engaged with them over their proposed policy to assure it was in compliance with the *IPC Guidelines*.

When we were looking at doing this program the Chief and I went to Toronto and spoke to [their IT manager], and he said that their agreement with the Privacy Commissioner was I think 72 hours [for image retention]. And we just kind of sent our message off to the Privacy Commissioner ‘this is what we plan to do, and if we put up cameras we’ll let you know where they are’ [...] I went [to Toronto] with him and we saw a few cameras to see how they had them laid out and what their policy was (Police participant).

Cobourg based their camera policy largely off of Toronto’s, as well as the *IPC Guidelines*. As a smaller agency, the Cobourg Police felt it was prudent to base their policies on Toronto’s in order to benefit from an established model which has been strengthened from additional resources.

Being a smaller place when you've got somewhere like Toronto where cameras are cameras doing the same thing, we've had other experiences in our years that why would we try to rewrite that if they've had their legal look at it, it's not something specific to Toronto, then we would piggyback on something like that (Police participant).

Implementing the Camera System

The grant application was successful, and the funds for two cameras were received in 2010. Two months before the CR grant program's spending deadline, the Cobourg police ran into problems with their installation. The company responsible for installing the cameras changed ownership, resulting in a delay. The Chief contacted the Ministry, concerned the delay would result in them missing the project deadline and requested an extension. A Ministry representative requested the Cobourg Police create an updated work plan that would show clear timelines between January and March (the deadline) to assure the project would be completed, and encouraged the CPS to get the installation company to hurry their process; an extension would require approval from the CR program's Director, and unused funds would be remitted for the next fiscal year. The CPS were able to install their cameras before the March 31st deadline, and by spring 2011, the camera program was up and running. The costs associated with re-deploying cameras and the existence of a fibre optic network resulted in two stationary cameras being installed instead of the proposed re-deployable cameras. One camera is located near a women's shelter in an area where drug activity was known to occur and the other near the waterfront for security purposes and situational awareness.

In accordance with the *IPC Guidelines*, a public consultation was held with a small turnout and little opposition heard.

We had a public meeting; I think it was January 20th of 2011. Twenty people showed up. There really as no opposition to it, I think one person, an older gentleman made some comment about just a little bit of concern about Big Brother watching but really was not opposed to it (Police participant).

Some objections were raised through local media, though this was described as minimal.

There's another group that I won't say that they do things wrong, but they will argue that their privacy is being violated. [...] there has been mention of it in the local media, the issues have been raised, it's been commented on, but you know I can't, can't say for sure, but I'm quite certain that there has not been any objections made to Cobourg council, town council, about the installation, not officially (DBIA participant).

The system is passively monitored, and the equipment is stored in a locked room at the police facility where monitors are turned off unless camera images are accessed after an incident occurs. Camera images have only been retained a handful of times. Participants feel, however, that the cameras have been a useful addition to crime prevention and crime control in their city, and anecdotally report that the cameras have deterred and reduced crime in the areas where cameras are located.

We do know based on the existing installations that there has been a reduction in reported crimes from those areas. [...] I don't know that we were presented with official statistics. [...] I meet with one of the managers of the women's shelter, and she's reported a reduction of crimes in the area as well (DBIA participant).

One participant noted that it may not matter what the cameras have actually produced in terms of outcomes, but what really matters is whether the community is satisfied with the expense and *feels* like the cameras are working.

The community identifies the need for enhanced security, the presence of the camera, they implement it, and they're able to look back at it and say 'yes that was a good decision.' In the end it doesn't really matter what quantitative results come back from that, what matters is that the community is satisfied with the expense. And, that's hard to measure, but you can get a sense of the sentiment overall and I think that sentiment is very positive (DBIA participant).

Expansions to the System

Recently there have been discussions about expanding the system to include another four cameras. The program enhancement was initiated by a member of the public who mentioned the need for more cameras at a council meeting, which the Mayor brought to the attention of the Police Service Board and Cobourg Police Service.

A member of the public came forward and said they would like to see another camera. [...] The Mayor brought that forward to the Police Services Board and the Chief looked at putting additional cameras in (Police participant).

The next [cameras], and it's in the process now, are primarily politically driven in that they Mayor has taken a keen interest and the Mayor sits on the Police Board, and he wants one in the downtown area in cooperation with the merchants and another one in Victoria park (PSB participant).

These cameras would serve security purposes downtown but also as municipal asset protection (particularly for police property). The cameras will be purchased by the CPS using surplus funds generated by criminal records checks. The CPS felt that they would be unsuccessful in obtaining grant funding for program enhancement, as they believed such programs were intended for new initiatives. While the criminal records checks funding was available prior to receiving the provincial grant in 2010, participants felt that by attaining external grant money they were able to free up internal money for other purposes (e.g. building renovations, patrol car purchases, etc). For these additional cameras and going forward, the CPS will be looking to establish partnerships with organizations in the town, such as the Cobourg DBIA and the City of Cobourg, to better service delivery and growth of the system.

DM: In the future you'll look to [community organizations] for a bigger partnership aspect?

R: If there's more [cameras] in the downtown area, very definitely. But, [...] the retail sector has been hit hard here in terms of economy and where it is and particularly the small independent business owners not only the

economy, but the Wal-marts and big box stores to compete with. So, I guess the board has sympathy for that [...] this next one is going to benefit the merchants as well, so yeah we would normally, we would look again for some support either directly or in kind. Something of that nature (PSB participant).

Conclusion

Similar to Cornwall and Belleville, Cobourg's camera program began after their Police Chief learned of the availability of the CR grant. The camera program almost ran into implementation issues, as they risked going over the spending deadline which would have possibly resulted in forfeiting the grant funds, and subsequently, their camera program. Grants will not be pursued for the upcoming expansions to their system, however, as Cobourg echoed Belleville's sentiment that grants are unlikely to finance cameras as they are no longer considered a novel initiative.

Cobourg's decision to learn from Toronto speaks to the pragmatic nature of policy learning and policy tourism. The Cobourg Police opted to learn from the experiences of a nearby, large and established camera system as they felt it was unwise to try and reinvent something that had already gone through the appropriate channels to assure it was being used properly. Being a smaller city with fewer resources, it was pragmatic to "piggyback" off of another city's resources and their successes. Cobourg directly referenced Toronto in their grant application, stating that they would be modeling their own system after Toronto's, even using the same vendor to supply the equipment. Thus, while Cobourg did not engage with any of the cities in this study, they nevertheless engaged in regional policy tourism not unlike their study counterparts, and for similar reasons: to benefit from the experiences of others in learning how to implement and operate camera systems as well as how to comply with existing privacy legislation to ensure success of their system.

Chapter 6

Failed Grant Applicants: Peterborough and Orillia

Introduction

The final two cities discussed in this chapter applied for the CR and POC grants but were not successful. Whereas Peterborough remains without a streetscape camera program, Orillia has secured local funds and now operates a streetscape system in their downtown area. These cities learned from their predecessors, namely Quinte West and Belleville, but this did not assure success with the grants. Belleville in particular has had a more influential role, passing down information not only about camera systems, but also advising and teaching cities about the grant application and its process. While Orillia's failure was most likely due to administrative error, Peterborough's lack of success is less clear. The experiences of Peterborough and Orillia provide support for the argument that grants facilitate faster and easier implementation of camera systems: without grant funding, cities may not be able to implement a camera system, as is seen with Peterborough. While Orillia was eventually able to secure funds locally, these non-grant funded systems take considerably longer to implement, demonstrated by the fact that it took their system nearly six years to become operational.

Peterborough

Introduction

Peterborough's streetscape camera history and its engagement with the CR and POC grant programs demonstrates how instrumental grant funds can be to the successful

implementation of streetscape camera systems. The city faced opposition and eventual rejection to the implementation of a DBIA-led, actively-monitored streetscape camera system in the early 2000s, as concerns were raised over privacy, spending local money, and the efficacy of camera technology (Hier 2010). A more recent push for cameras addressed some of these concerns through the use of grant funds: it would be a passively-monitored system led by the police, and paid for using external grant funds. It was felt that the concerns over privacy that felled the first attempt had dissipated, and local stakeholders were now on board pending the availability of grant money. Despite modeling their grant applications on Belleville's successful example, the grant bids ultimately failed, and Peterborough is still without the capital to implement a streetscape system. Thus, a lack of funding remains the biggest impediment to Peterborough's streetscape system.

Camera Program Background and Beginnings

Peterborough is a city located on the Otonabee River in central Ontario, 125 kilometres northeast of Toronto (approximate population 78,698 in 2011) (Statistics Canada 2011e). While Peterborough has had a city-operated camera system since 2001, it is not a streetscape camera system. The city operates twelve cameras (Hier 2010: 174) on publicly owned property (e.g. parks, libraries). The city's system was investigated by the Ontario IPC in 2002 to ensure it was in compliance with the privacy protection *Guidelines*; a number of recommendations were made during this evaluation. In 2004, however, the Ontario IPC received a number of complaints that the city was in violation

of the *Guidelines*, which prompted another investigation and a new bout of recommendations (Hier 2010: 174).

Around the same time, community organizations, including the Peterborough Downtown Business Improvement Association sought to increase the number of cameras in the city to cover the downtown core. The desire for more cameras was motivated by issues around late-night, post-bar crowds, particularly incidents of vandalism, rowdiness and violence. The Executive Director of the Peterborough DBIA at the time presented the proposal for an expansion of cameras into the downtown to city council, and proposed that the DBIA would fund \$85,000 toward the purchase and installation of the cameras (Hier 2010: 174). The system was to be live monitored; operational and maintenance costs would fall to the city to fund once the cameras were installed. Public consultations were held to inform the community and business owners, and to also gather feedback about the proposed initiative. Concerns over privacy, effectiveness and cost were raised by the local newspaper, the *Peterborough Examiner*, as well as councillors and a local interest group called Stop the Cameras Coalition (STCC). The STCC waged an effective campaign against the cameras using a number of strategies (Hier et al. 2007: 741-4) which ultimately led to the initiative's defeat in 2005.

The desire for cameras in the downtown did not disappear, however. In 2009, Peterborough Lakefield Community Police (PLCP) Chief Murray Rodd tasked Staff Sergeant Dan Smith with creating a business case for cameras as part of a course at the Canadian Police College.

Chief Rodd has always been a proponent of trying to enhance safety of downtown, so as part of a project I did at the Canadian Police College, I did a business case concerning need to implement CCTV in higher crime areas in the downtown core. This was the crux of his research project. It was

based on 54% of citizens surveyed during a satisfaction survey saying they felt unsafe downtown at night. So, we looked at different high profile crimes committed downtown, realized fairly significant benefit to private cameras downtown – try to enhance what we already have and move forward with a system they have a little more control over. That was the start of the project (Staff Sgt Smith).

Concerns over issues in the downtown persisted, and it was hoped that cameras could address the perception of safety downtown, as well as vandalism, graffiti, and drug use in particular. Thus, in 2011, Sgt. Smith's business case formed the basis of a new proposal for cameras in the downtown after learning of the availability of grant funds to finance streetscape systems. The Police Service Board approved their proposal, and the police were given approval in principle from city council to explore funding options for downtown cameras.

It went to the Police Service Board first. They approved, that was in 2011, the Police Service Board basically gave their support to go to council. The DBIA fully supported, they have over 600 members. They were even willing to become a partner to help with on-going maintenance. We went to city council, they gave approval in principle to explore funding options (Police participant).

While the PLCP supported the earlier attempts to establish cameras in the city, they were not in a financial position to drive the program. The PLCP initiated the program for this most recent attempt due to both the ability of the cameras to be financed with external grant money available only to police, as well as the inability of local organizations – including the DBIA and police – to fund the cameras themselves.

DM: What has changed in terms of getting police to spearhead this rather than the community initiative?

R: Probably their ability to secure the funding to make it happen. [The DBIA has] kind of a limited budget. We have committed to supporting the program by looking after the maintenance of these cameras. But the actual hardware and wiring into the police station and that kind of stuff is really in the hands of police because they are, if they get the grant they can pay for it. So they are spearheading it with our support (DBIA participant).

Not only would the grant enable the program materially, but participants assumed that community members would be more supportive of cameras if they were funded with grant money rather than local budgets-cum-taxes.

DM: [Do you think] people kind of had a better response to it then they would if it was taken from a local budget?

R: Perhaps, because any money taken out of local budget then can potentially lead to increases taxes, and so maybe once again the perception is that it's money coming from another source that was derived from criminal activity so what better way to use it then to put it back to fight crime? [...] and if I didn't work for the police service I would probably feel that way too. I would probably feel a lot better knowing that that money came from proceeds of crime as opposed to out of some reserve fund from City Hall that could potentially end up in a tax increase (Police participant).

If this had come out of the budget I think there might be a lot of people saying 'we'd rather you spend the city's budget on for patrols'. But if this is a grant that specific to cameras and it's not going to be jeopardizing money spent on for patrols, then I don't think that's an issue now. It may have been had there not been a grant (DBIA participant).

The Grant Application and Proposed System

Staff Sgt. Smith applied for both the Civil Remedies and Proceeds of Crime grant, the former grant predicated on receipt of the latter. The applications were virtually identical¹⁹, and the CR application stated that initiative fulfilled the grant program requirements by assisting victims and preventing victimization as the camera program was intended to deter and capture unlawful activity on camera (to assist the identification and apprehension of perpetrators), as well as increasing the perception of safety in these areas. The cameras would be installed in downtown areas where higher crime rates were recorded (though no statistics accompanied this claim) and argued that cameras would

¹⁹ Through the FOI request, I was able to obtain Peterborough's CR grant application; however, as stated earlier, a FOI request was not submitted for POC applications. As such, this section deals only with the CR application. Police participants from Peterborough claimed that the application content was the same for both the POC and CR applications, however.

help to deal more effectively with “quality of life” issues as well as more serious crimes (Belleville’s influence is seen here, as Peterborough borrows word-for-word in this section). They demonstrated a need for their program by highlighting a survey that said over half of the residents felt unsafe in the downtown at night.

Areas of operation were basically going to be in identified areas where crime and antisocial behaviour had been identified as being higher than in other areas of the city and downtown. They ask for the demonstrated need, so we went through some of the issues downtown, that it was one of our community-based prevention and problem solving goals identified in our last business plan. We addressed the fact that downtown Peterborough is a busy area 18 hours a day, 60 bars and restaurants located in close proximity. Those are basically the areas that we have the issues with antisocial behaviour and assaults. We’ve tried other initiatives that have been implemented over the years since 2011, including increased foot patrol, pay duty officers at peak periods, initiatives with the bar owners to try to deal with issues like zero tolerance and stuff like that. Basically with those initiatives, things never changed so we thought we had demonstrated that need. [...] We obviously felt that a camera system wasn’t the solution to the criminal behaviour but it was a cost-effective and reasonable response to the escalating crime (Police participant).

Thus, the initiative was rationalized as another, cost-effective tool to address on-going issues in their downtown. They expressed a commitment to providing financial reports as needed and to produce crime statistics, as well as surveys among businesses and residents.

The grant applications were submitted for thirteen cameras; ten from the POC grant and three from the CR grant. In the event that they did not receive the full amount, however, the size or quality of the system would be amended.

The sophistication of equipment will depend on how much money they have, or how many cameras depends [on how much they get]. I think they were looking at eight in the downtown core. But if they got enough they might do twelve. If not enough they may do four (DBIA participant).

The cameras were intended to be passively monitored, to avoid liability issues and privacy concerns, but also to keep monitoring costs low.

R: We felt that there might be some liability issues involved in live monitoring if a crime in progress was going on. So we wanted to stay away from the live monitoring aspect of it.

DM: Ok and what do you mean by liability?

R: Well if maybe they're not watching intently enough and realize that there's a crime going on somebody's been beat up or something like that [...] 'why didn't you see it?' or 'why didn't you get somebody here to stop it?'. Plus it's the cost factor too. That's probably the biggest thing (Police participant).

It's my understanding that the police have indicated that the cameras would not be monitored [...] If we were successful in receiving a grant to have the cameras installed, I would make certain that I brought it up, that we had concerns that the public needs the comfort of knowing we aren't spending their money to monitor the cameras in real time and that we're not invading their privacy as such with the Big Brother concern (City participant).

Not only were live monitoring costs prohibitive, but participants felt uncomfortable spending taxpayer money to actively monitor their community.

Policy Learning and Tourism

The grant applications were composed with the help of the Belleville Police Service: they not only gave advice on the application and their camera system, but they also provided Sgt. Smith with a copy of their successful grant application. Sgt. Smith also used information from other operational camera systems in the region (Toronto, Sudbury and London), which he had collected as part of the research for his business case.

[Belleville] were the most recent that had received funding, it just seemed like they, seemed like such an easy process for them. [...] Belleville's system was basically exactly what we wanted, we would have mirrored their [policy] [...] We looked at some other cities that had implemented [cameras] and the fact that they had used those cameras to solve crimes, deter crimes, reduce victimization – re-victimization (Police participant).

Belleville advised Peterborough on the types of technology available, and Peterborough had planned to implement a wireless system similar to Belleville. Belleville provided information on the costs and maintenance needs of such a system, and Peterborough used

this information to anticipate the kind of system they would operate as well as the projected outcomes. Peterborough had also planned to consult Belleville's policies when creating their own, mirroring their system both technologically as well as operationally. The Peterborough Police also expected to draw from the city's existing video surveillance policy.

The PLCP also engaged with the IPC *Guidelines* in anticipation of creating their camera policy. The PLCP were sent a copy of the *Guidelines* after the IPC received a complaint from the public that the police were intending to establish cameras in the city. Participants expressed that they felt the *Guidelines* were straightforward, with the primary emphasis being that cameras could not see into private, residential spaces where there was an expectation of privacy.

R: As long as everything falls into compliance with the privacy commission, that's basically the main driving force, is it has to be in compliance with it.

DM: Have you looked at the *Guidelines* at all?

R: Yep.

DM: Do you find them to be pretty straightforward?

DS: Yep. [...] I think it's pretty clear that you can't, if, my interpretation is that if the general public can see it, there's no expectation of privacy. So if there's, you know, you obviously have to make sure that your cameras are facing public space and not anywhere close to somebody's apartment window, or something that you could view something that wasn't available to the general public (Police participant).

Police participants expressed that they intended to avoid privacy issues by passively-monitoring the system and retaining images for a short period of time.

We're not interested in what Joe public is doing downtown. We have no intentions of live monitoring the cameras, which was a key factor in my view. The retention on any stored images would be fairly short so that if we, I know some are looking at the area of 7-10 days, so we're not talking long term storage of images. So any of those arguments made about invasion of privacy, I think that they have to look at the number of times they are on video camera on a daily basis [...] I mean you're on camera

everywhere you go anyway, nobody seems to have a problem with it (Police participant).

Participants also felt that arguments about invasions of privacy were weakened considering the widespread use of cameras in everyday life. Indeed, participants argue that concerns over privacy have changed since the last time cameras were raised as a possibility. Privacy concerns are seen to be no longer applicable because of changing times, both in that they are increasingly ubiquitous, but also that high profile incidents worldwide have demonstrated a place for cameras.

My understanding was that [cameras were] raised some seven or eight years ago and was met with support from the businesses but it met with was a lot of anger and opposition from people who felt that maybe their rights are being jeopardized by being on camera. I think since then a lot of stuff [has happened] and there's been a lot of major that incidents happened around the world [caught on camera] [...] People realize too that in a lot of public places even in our Millennium Park down here there are cameras. So really it's become that people are aware and they realize that when you go to the bank and the bank machine, there's a camera there. You're surrounded by that now so and in some instances people do feel a lot safer. The understanding of the concept has [increased] (DBIA participant).

Encountering Difficulties and Setbacks: Grant Failure

In late 2012, PLCP were notified that both grant applications were unsuccessful. Participants felt they had demonstrated sufficient need and fulfilled all of the criteria, and attributed their application failure to the fact that cameras were no longer considered an initiative worth funding, according to the Ministries.

What it boiled down to was they obviously have different priorities set for their funding. I know that they've funded a lot of cameras in Belleville, Cobourg, and different smaller municipalities and maybe cameras just weren't the flavour of the year this year. [...] We felt we had submitted a pretty good document, as far as covering all of the content... It was disappointing because we thought we were on the right track to move ahead with it and we thought we had all the right reasons and answers and thought we had a demonstrated need for it (Police participant).

The CR grant committee minutes indicates that Peterborough's CR application was denied as their main application through the POC grant program was unsuccessful. As CR grant was contingent on the success of the POC grant, the CR application was automatically rejected. The reason for the failure of the POC grant is not known, however. Despite best efforts at emulating previously successful applications, Peterborough was unable to obtain the needed grant funds, perhaps due to their proposal and application, or due to other extrinsic circumstances (e.g. other considerations in the grant evaluation process, such as whether Peterborough and/or the surrounding area had received grant funds in current or previous years for other initiatives, making other less-funded areas more desirable candidates to receive grant money). There is currently very little expectation that cameras can or will be funded with money from the Police Service. Participants now feel that it is funding, not privacy concerns, that is the main impediment to installing cameras.

R: Well really funding has been the main stumbling block. We seem to have supports in place from Police Services Board, City Council, DBIA... There's, I think there's been a shift in the mindset of the general public with regards to the viability of cameras so realistically I would say the biggest stumbling block is money.

DM: So what are the next steps?

R: Grow a money tree? (Police participant).

After the grant applications were rejected in late 2012 and two more violent incidents occurred in the downtown area in early 2013, city council asked city staff to prepare a report on cameras – both how to buy and install, as well as some of the pros and cons of such a system (My Kawartha, Jan 29, 2013). Further, council carried a motion in February to send a letter to the MPP of the area, Jeff Leal, to ask for funding for the cameras, and in the event it is not available, that cameras be put up for consideration in

the 2014 city budget (Peterborough City Council, February 4, 2013). At the time of writing, Peterborough is still without a funding commitment that would enable the purchase and installation of downtown streetscape cameras.

Conclusion

The city of Peterborough has faced a number of obstacles in implementing a streetscape camera program for their downtown area. Initial concerns centered on the privacy implications of camera technology and their monitoring capabilities, whereas more recent impediments have been largely financial. The PLCP have attempted to address these issues by securing grant funds to finance their camera system; however, despite trying to emulate the neighbouring city of Belleville's successful grant application, Peterborough failed to receive any grant money. With the support from stakeholders and the community now in place, funding remains the city's biggest roadblock to installing and operating a streetscape system.

Through the examination of Peterborough, we now see Belleville's role in advising more recent cities on both their camera systems as well as the grant application process. While the motive for soliciting advice and borrowing documents (such as past applications) would be to learn from the successes of predecessors in order to facilitate one's own, this example demonstrates that policy learning does not guarantee successful outcomes. Participants felt that they had adequately followed the example laid out for them, and attributed their inability to attain grant funds to the belief that cameras were no longer seen as novel or "the flavour of the month", a similar notion expressed by other cities who would not pursue grants for future system expansion. Belleville's major

contribution to Peterborough appears to be the guidance provided with respect to the grant application, though they also advocated for the kind of camera technology used in Belleville and gave information on their system's policy. Participants from Peterborough echoed their regional counterparts in their emphasis on general privacy protection – viewing only public areas and not using the cameras to focus on the activities of particular individuals – and selective attention to, and interpretation of, particular aspects of the IPC *Guidelines* (in this case, image retention periods).

Orillia

Introduction

Orillia is the only city in this study to have implemented a camera system entirely with locally-sourced funds, and it is also the only system in this study not driven by the city's police service. Advocates from Orillia's Police Service Board had pushed for a camera system since 2008, but the system encountered setbacks due to a lack of support from community stakeholders, and a related lack of financial resources to make the system possible. Orillia attempted to secure a POC grant in 2010, but was unsuccessful. The PSB persisted, and once the right mix of stakeholders was in place (due to council changes, staff turn-over, etc.), the city finally agreed to fund the camera system in 2011. Two more years passed before Orillia's camera system was finally operational in late 2013, over five years after it was initially raised. Without grant funds, Orillia encountered a number of additional challenges in securing and rationalizing the use local funds. The

support of community stakeholders in allocating local money was key to getting this city's camera system operational.

Orillia also presents a strong case for the networking, policy learning and policy tourism influence of grant programs. Orillia relied most heavily on policy learning from their regional neighbours in developing and implementing their camera system and its attendant policies. Quinte West and Belleville were particularly instrumental in the development of Orillia's camera system: Quinte West was visited to learn about camera technology, design and operation as well as aspects of privacy protection, and Quinte West also visited Orillia three times to promote the use of camera technology and assuage any concerns to the community as well as influential community stakeholders; Belleville was also visited to learn about camera system design and operation, as well as advice on applying for future CR or POC grants. Armed with advice and policy documents from a number of regional cities, participants from Orillia felt that policy creation was relatively straightforward. Rather than Orillia benefitting from a diffusion pattern whereby policies are refined and sharpened as they are passed down, however, we instead see "cherry picking" and selective adoption of certain aspects from different cities' policies as well as the *IPC Guidelines*. Thus, where we might expect to see the benefits of policy diffusion, we continue to see variation in how camera systems and their policies are designed, implemented and operated.

Camera Program Background and Beginnings

Orillia (approximate population 40,731 in 2011) (Statistics Canada 2011d) is located in south-central Ontario between Lake Couchiching and Lake Simcoe,

approximately 135km north of Toronto. Orillia attracts a large number of tourists in the summer months, and has year-round visitors to the area due to its proximity to a large casino and entertainment venue, Casino Rama. The headquarters for the OPP are also located in Orillia, and police services in the area are provided by the OPP as well.

Orillia's camera system history dates back to 2008, when cameras were first raised as a possibility by the Police Service Board. Representatives from the PSB wanted cameras in the downtown to address drug transactions and drug use, as well issues with disorderly, violent behaviours associated with the after-hours bar crowd. A committee was then established, composed of Police Service Board members and the previous OPP Inspector, tasked with finding out more information on camera systems. Shortly thereafter, the committee visited Quinte West and received demonstrations of the equipment and advice and information on how to design and operate a camera system.

Well in 2008 this was brought to the Police Services Board as a recommendation to look into it as we felt that it would be a great tool to assist our police in solving crime. This is what the idea was at the time. So, as a result they formed a committee with myself as a the chair, and our [police] inspector of the day, Terry Right, and the [Police Service Board] chair of the day, Don McNeil, the three of us got set on this committee to investigate it. So, Quinte West had come up, because they'd been in operation for seven, eight months at that time. And we had contacted them and they agreed to allow us to go over and go through the whole process. They brought the company that installed their system there as well. So we went over and spent the day going through the community, seeing how the cameras were installed, where they were installed, how they were signed, what areas that they could [see] because the surveillance cameras where there. And the monitoring system which was in the police facility, over there of course, they're monitored 24/7 [...]. And one of the things that really kind of sold us was we were able to watch the cameras as a car went through an intersection, we could actually go back and pick that up, bring that up, have a look at the license plate, it's expiry date, fairly clear. And we could also, which they explained to us they didn't do this on a regular basis, was to bring a face of a person up down at the waterfront, down at the canal there, and they did that just to show us that you could bring it up just like I'm looking at you right here. So then we thought these would be you know,

great tools for identification. And so we went through the system, how they operated, and cost, and this sort of thing. And then we came back, made a recommendation to the Police Services Board. Police Services Board agreed that we would send this on to council

Representatives from the committee were particularly impressed with the capability to review recorded images and to manipulate the cameras to get detailed, high quality images for identification. The Quinte West OPP Detachment Commander, Inspector Earl Johns, also visited Orillia three times to give presentations to the business community and council on their camera system and what cameras could do in the city of Orillia.

Inspector Johns, who was Inspector of the day, made three trips over to Orillia, during 2008, 2009, and 2010 to do a presentation to the public. Like all our downtown merchants and downtown Chamber of Commerce. We brought them in, this room right here actually, and [Quinte West] did presentations. They did one at the council chambers board to explain what the system is going to be used for and how we were going to comply with the Ontario Privacy Commissioner's *Guidelines*, that sort of thing, how this could be done primarily using, again, Quinte West's [policies] for signage and making sure the monitoring system as facilitated in a police facility in a secure area (PSB participant).

Inspector Johns stressed the importance of the IPC *Guidelines*, and how Orillia could use Quinte West's policies to ensure they were compliant. Particular emphasis was placed on properly notifying the community of cameras through adequate signage, and assuring the monitoring equipment was secure and used properly (i.e. no abuse).

Encountering Difficulties and Setbacks: Resistance and Grant Failure

The committee wrote a report on their visits to Quinte West and made a successful recommendation to the PSB to pursue cameras. The PSB then put the initiative forward to city council. At this point, the camera project faced resistance: council members, the city manager, and members of the Downtown Orillia Management Board (DOMB) had

concerns about privacy, the efficacy of cameras and preferring other initiatives over cameras (i.e. better lighting and more street patrols).

[The DOMB were] approached in March. Most issues that come to the BIA table are immediately in agreement in one way or another, pretty easy to predict what's good or bad for business – cameras were something people are split on. The benefits and the privacy issues [...] The board itself voted and talk to strongly about other policing methods before cameras came in, like better lighting or foot patrols. And we had concerns about who is operating, who was going to be monitored (DOMB participant).

Despite this opposition, the Police Service Board persisted with the camera program. Unconvinced business owners in Orillia shared the same opinion as the DOMB directorate, the Police Service Board administered their own survey to businesses and merchants in the city.

The story was, the downtown management, we'd sent letters to them, and they sent them back 'not interested', sent letters to them, sent them back 'not interested'. However [...] people were coming up to me, merchants saying 'what the heck's going on, I thought we were going to get these cameras, we really want these cameras'. I said 'just a second, your people, your executive said they didn't want them', they said 'the executive isn't speaking for us' so that's why we did the survey. So we said 'ok, well look at, we will do a survey of all the people', all the business people [...] We did a survey of the downtown core and I think it's seventy four percent something like that nature, I have it in all these papers somewhere, that were in favour of having the downtown core under surveillance. We sent a copy of the survey and the results to the downtown management. But the big thing was, the Chamber of Commerce, from day 1, which carries a much larger area of business people, and are a hundred percent behind it all the way (PSB participant).

Members of the Downtown Management Board retorted that they had preferred a more incremental approach before resorting to cameras, and were concerned with the way the survey was administered and the phrasing of the questions asked.

R: We said we prefer if you spend the money elsewhere before you escalated to cameras, like improve the lighting, more patrols, and if still a problem then yeah maybe cameras should be [installed]. And then in 2011 they went forward. The Police Service Board, after our response, sent out a

survey to all of our members and there was some political stuff about... basically, not going through the proper channels.

DM: There was a survey, what did they ask?

R: If they supported the cameras. I know there was concern at the board level to that it was worded kind of... The typical kind of blue sky, loaded "well of course I support longer sentences for criminals..." It was done, in a kind of, 'wait a minute you have to look at both, balance sides of [the debate]'. They didn't get a big response to it and the response that they did receive wasn't... It was only very very few people responded, they didn't get even 50% support at that point [DOMB participant].

In early 2010 the Police Service Board, in conjunction with the then-OPP Detachment Commander, submitted an application to the Proceeds of Crime grant

The application stated the grant was for a crime prevention initiative utilizing surveillance cameras as a tool to assist with deterring and solving crime and reducing anti-social behaviour, while also creating a safer community. Where asked to demonstrate need, the application points out that many "progressive businesses" use cameras to enhance safety and apprehend offenders as they are caught on film; it also states that other municipalities like Trenton (Quinte West), Sudbury and Toronto also use cameras and report successes in using cameras to assist with investigations. The application argues that cameras will be installed in strategic areas, acting as "eight additional sets of eyes monitoring the City on a 24 hour basis for the cost of one set of boots on the ground". It is explained that the normal budget cannot accommodate capital expenditures such as this and the rising cost of policing has created a burden on taxpayers in Orillia. They promised to hold another public meeting in addition to the two already held, and to produce brochures and publish information on the Orillia PSB website to promote the system and inform the public. Finally, the system will be evaluated through crime statistics and community meetings to determine public opinion; the camera locations will also be reviewed to assure compliance with the FIPPA (*IPC Guidelines*).

Similar to the other cities' applications, Orillia promotes the deterrence and detection capabilities of cameras, and argues that they are intended for crime prevention in the community. The application references the successful use of cameras in other cities to suggest their use in Orillia will generate more of the same. And finally, it presents a financial argument for cameras: Orillia's own budget cannot accommodate the cost of cameras so a grant is required, but the initiative is a good investment as it is cost-effective in comparison to what it costs to employ a police officer. The grant asked for \$103,000 to fund the purchase and installation of cameras in the downtown. The maximum amount of funding from this grant was \$100,000 and as such, the PSB felt they were ineligible because their application was in excess of the maximum amount; in addition, they also missed the submission deadline.

R1²⁰: There is an area where you can apply for funding, Quinte West did after they installed their original system, and a couple years ago they made an application, they got funding to build or expand their system. And that's what our hope is here, is because money from crime, that's what they used there, that's what they used in Quinte West, and we made application as well but at the time we were a little slow getting off the mark.

R2: It was the Inspector who had applied on the board's behalf and, I guess we had asked for \$103,000 and I guess the maximum funding was \$100,000 and that's where they said 'you're denied' because we asked too much, just automatically [...] I think we were thrown out with the bathwater. So, that is as far as I know the reason why we were denied. [...] I think he missed the deadline. So it was a whole comedy of errors that just we were not successful (PSB participants).

The Police Service Board continued to keep the camera project alive, but participants felt their difficulty in getting the project off the ground was due to a number of setbacks (e.g. waiting for budget approval, having agreements in place, etc) and processes of "re-educating" key individuals in who had changed positions (e.g. new Detachment Commanders or council members).

²⁰ The designation of "1" and "2" refers to responses given during by two participants.

R1: There were times where we had to wait for budget approval, for funding, applied for grants, so we're waiting to see what the result would be for that... Councils changed, Detachment Commanders changed, so it was sort of... I wouldn't say it was a setback, but we had to educate the new parties on what the project was all about.

R2: Yeah you're right, that's kind, of start, not on the beginning but...

DM: Starting over continually?

R1: Yeah exactly, and then of course there was, you know working with the OPP, could we put it in their facility, if so, where would we put it, who would monitor it? So there's all of these sorts of discussions that have gone and when you wait for people to report back, it takes some time, and you know it was quite easy for I think five years to pass by (PSB participant).

Implementing the Camera System and Policy Creation

In 2011, the camera program received a \$125,000 commitment from city council after it was known that the city would not receive any provincial funding. The camera program encountered minor resistance, which participants gauged mostly from comments sections in online versions of community newspapers. Community members were concerned about the cost of the system, but participants argued it was a cost-effective initiative.

R1: Our local newspaper has blogs, so they post the news and citizens chime in on what their opinions are... And when the funding had been approved there were so many public outcry that \$125,000 is being put towards this initiative and could it be better spent putting more police officers on the road, which absolutely a valid concern.

R2: It was. And actually, I, I dealt with that at a group meeting I was at one night when this came up. And, it costs, \$130,000 a year to put a police officer on the street. We've got four cameras, so we got four police officers working 24/7, they don't get sick time, and they don't get holidays, they work 24/7 and so \$125,000 was a pretty good deal sort of thing, that's the way I explained it to them (PSB participant).

The PSB, aided with the help of an IT consultant, put out a Request for Proposals (RFP) from companies in the area who would assist with the purchase and installation of cameras. Initially the PSB had hoped for cameras to be installed at six intersections in the

downtown, but due to the hiring of a consultant to help prepare the RFP and other incidental costs, only four intersections are covered.

I think originally we wanted six [intersections], we had to whittle it down to four because we had to hire the consultants and other things but I think in the future we're hoping that once we prove the success of the four that council will support adding on additional cameras (PSB participant).

The OPP, having had little involvement throughout the process, were on board with the camera initiative, pending the finalization of Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) agreements between the police and the city. The images are wirelessly transmitted and the camera monitors are housed in a room at the OPP facility, though the building and the camera room are city property (the OPP lease the building from the city). The Orillia OPP were not prepared to take any sort of lead on the camera project, and negotiating police access to the camera room and the particulars of the MoU between city, PSB and police brought additional setbacks.

The only role [the police] would play, they may come to us and ask where we feel, from calls for service, crime standpoint, where should we put the cameras? And certainly we would say, the final decision rests with you but if we [the police] were installing a camera, intersection 'A' and 'C' is where we would do it (Police participant).

There is very much a partnership with municipal [government] and OPP but the terms really have to be defined. [...] It's been a challenge to figure that out, but once we have figured it out, we're good to go, and we know where each party has his or her responsibilities (PSB participant).

The OPP felt strongly that the camera program should be compliant with all relevant legislation. They requested that a privacy impact assessment (PIA) be carried out, in compliance with the *IPC Guidelines*; however, the PSB decided not to undertake a PIA as the cost would take up more of their camera budget.

Now, something else that we're working with the detachment commander is the OPP had indicated we would have to undertake a Privacy Impact

Assessment (PIA) in order to house the surveillance cameras in the detachment. Upon further investigation, it's quite an undertaking, it's quite expensive, we talked to consultants and it range anywhere from \$25,000 to more to have that so we've sent correspondence back to OPP headquarters which is here in Orillia and we've stated that we are going to fully comply with the IPC's *Guidelines* and would that be sufficient? We haven't heard back from them. That could or could not be a deal breaker if they say 'it's mandatory that you have a PIA', then we might have to look at alternative locations for the monitoring station (PSB participant).

Additional inquiries to other cities with camera systems were also made prior to implementing their camera system. PSB members visited Belleville with similar intentions of learning not only about their camera system, but also about the provincial grant program which funded the purchase and installation of Belleville's cameras.

Also part of our research, in July, some members of the Police Services Board, our chair and myself, we actually went down to the city of Belleville and they have approximately, I think its 17 video surveillance cameras in their downtown core. And their Chief, Chief McMullan, is a very strong proponent for surveillance cameras, she basically opened the doors for us to come in and she invited us to basically review all of their equipment, tour the cameras, tour their downtown, take a look at their provincial grants, and she even offered to help us draft our own provincial grant, and she's done that for several municipalities who are sort of in the same position we are. So she was an excellent resource too. I think Belleville's Chief McMullan sort of inherited Inspector Johns [of Quinte West] passion for surveillance cameras (PSB participant).

Belleville's Chief of Police, Cory McMullan, was an important resource for Orillia's camera project, sharing advice, information and relevant documents, and even offering to help draft a provincial grant application. The cities of Toronto, Sudbury and Peterborough were also contacted for similar information-gathering purposes.

Peterborough, we are currently reviewing their policies and procedures because they had to undertake a big review I think because the IPC had [investigated]. [...] And Sudbury [...] I talked to staff Sergeant of Toronto on surveillance cameras. They're used down there, and they primarily use them down there for assisting in crime, solving the crime, sort of thing (PSB participant).

Orillia's camera policy was created by the PSB's Executive Assistant who drew on both the *Guidelines* provided by the Ontario IPC office, as well as the policies provided by other cities with operational camera systems. The Executive Assistant found that the information learned from other cities had been most useful in creating their own policies.

I think it's liaising with the other municipalities who have taken on this path. They have been so welcoming to show us what they've gone through to show us their policies and procedures, and they've been very vocal about the hiccups that they've encountered, so we've known what mistakes not to make, you know, we've had sort of bumps in the road through the learning process, but for the most part, they have just been very forthright and open with their entire processes. I've gotten policy and procedure manuals, signage, the wording of the signage that they have to post where the cameras are located just like you said, anecdotes of 'oh, you know we've tried this surveillance company, and it didn't work out so well, we tried this consulting firm, they were phenomenal' (PSB Executive Assistant).

The Executive Assistant expressed that she felt the IPC *Guidelines* were straightforward, and would use them, alongside information learned from other cities, pulling "what they like" to create policies of their own.

I think [the IPC] *Guidelines* are very self-explanatory and thorough. It's just a matter of putting [*Guidelines*] into a template and that's where the networking with the other municipalities has been beneficial because why reinvent the wheel when you've got the city of Peterborough who's already been investigated by the IPC, complied with all their requirements, I think we're pretty much going to just plagiarize what they've put together [...] So we know what to avoid and we know what to take that as proven to be successful for them,. I've got templates from different municipalities, so I'll just pull what I like from each and, and it's, a fairly straightforward process now that I have those templates in front of me (PSB Executive Assistant).

Not only has Orillia learned from a number of cities in creating their camera program, but similar to Belleville, they are also now in a position to teach subsequent communities about camera systems. Participants indicated that other cities (e.g. Barrie) had approached them to learn about their camera system.

Now I'm getting municipalities who are hearing Orillia is undertaking this and they're saying 'oh, well...' we're sort of in the position now where we're sort of tutoring, and sort of, so, we're sort of passing the torch that municipalities that helped us, we're returning the favour and paying it forward in a way (PSB participant).

In fact, through this process of soliciting advice, some of Orillia's enquiries about camera policy stumped the operators of Quinte West's system, encouraging them to evaluate and audit their own system to assure it in compliance with the *IPC Guidelines*. This suggests that learning is not unidirectional, but that cities engage in mutual learning processes, where newly established cities can teach older cohorts.

I think [Quinte West] has learned from us. When I started asking questions, they started scratching their heads. Like concrete MoUs about who does what, how and when, so they are revisiting those (PSB participant).

Further, the process of seeking information on camera systems from other cities resulted in increased networking and information sharing *in general* among law enforcement and municipal agencies.

I'm sort of consulting more with municipal police forces than I have before and if I hadn't been for the surveillance cameras, I doubt I would have done that, I probably would have just stuck to OPP municipalities. So, that's sort of opened the doors to consult with them and see what they do and it has sort of snowballed into... I'm seeing sort of things they get in terms of inspector reports or chief of police reports that I'm going to my detachment commander and asking if we can get that. So absolutely, it's sort of broadening my horizons (PSB participant).

Thus, policy learning is neither uni-directional nor limited to one initiative, but can result in cities teaching each other about a variety of programs and initiatives.

Implementation of the system was stalled in the spring of 2013 after the company contracted to install the cameras declared bankruptcy. Further delays occurred as the Executive Assistant wanted to assure their policies were compliant with privacy legislation, with respect to how the cameras were positioned and the proper training of

staff, before the system was in full operation (Hashizume, Aug 26, 2013). In mid-September 2013, twelve cameras located in four intersections became operational in downtown Orillia (City of Orillia, 2013). The PSB plans to expand the system beyond their initial installation, building on anticipated successes of the system. They will look to utilize the CR and POC grant programs as much as possible to fund these future additions.

DM: Would you consider applying for grants in the future?

R: Absolutely, most definitely. Yes. But again I think we'd have to prove ourselves with the four that we are installing, that it is successful, and hopefully once we do that then we build a stronger case for ourselves and then you know live and learn, we'll know not to ask for so much money [in the application] (PSB participant).

Conclusion

Orillia is unique in this study not only because their camera system has been funded without grant money, but also because it is the only program to be driven by a Police Service Board. Police Service Board advocates believed strongly in the utility of camera technology and proactively pushed for cameras for over five years: they submitted surveys to the business community to drum up support, engaged in policy tourism and networking with a number of cities, and facilitated the POC grant application (submitted by the OPP on their behalf). The persistence paid off after some time had passed and those who opposed the cameras were replaced with stakeholders who supported the camera program. Orillia's experience in obtaining the financial resources needed for a streetscape camera system shows that while it is quite possible for systems to be funded locally without grant funds, the establishment process is more drawn out and can encounter difficulties if community support is not in place. Had money been

furnished by a grant rather than the city, concerns raised over the cost and efficacy of cameras may have been quietened, as was the case with other cities in this study.

As we have seen, Orillia has engaged with a number of cities in order to learn about camera systems and how best to implement one in their own city. Orillia made policy tourism visits to both Quinte West and Belleville, received visits from Quinte West's camera advocate, Inspector Earl Johns, and also consulted Toronto, Sudbury and Peterborough. The Orillia PSB wanted to learn how to implement a system that would serve their needs, as well as being compliant with the relevant privacy legislation; to this end, they consulted the *IPC Guidelines*, as well as the policies of their neighbours to see their interpretation and application of the privacy legislation. Through policy learning and policy tourism, Orillia accumulated a great deal of advice, information and policy documents which have been picked over and selectively drawn from in creating their own camera program and policy. These policy documents are not viewed as contributing to a cumulative and comprehensive privacy policy, but rather, are discrete documents to be utilized as they are needed; policymakers have a singular view and "pick what they like" and what works for them when creating policy, fostering interpretation and variation rather than strengthening collective best practice. Orillia has begun to advise subsequent cities hoping to establish camera systems, transitioning from being a learner in the policy learning process to taking on a teaching role. They have given advice and information to Barrie about their experiences thus far, and through Orillia's own policy learning exercises, they have also motivated an established city, Quinte West, to review and amend their existing policies.

Finally, Orillia is among the cities in this study who speak positively about the use of grants for future additions to their system. Learning from their previous experience and knowing what mistakes to avoid, as well as the positive advice given by Belleville, combined with the (anticipated) successes they feel they will be able to demonstrate with their current system, Orillia feels that they will be able to present a stronger application in the future.

Chapter 7

Discussion and Concluding remarks

Introduction

The final chapter of this thesis summarizes and discusses the arguments and central themes of the study, and draws out implications of the findings for existing and future streetscape camera systems as well as the study's implications for grant programs in general and their influence on crime policy.

Summary of Findings: The Influence of Grant Programs on Canadian Streetscape Systems

The cities included in this study shared common implementation experiences: many were experiencing issues in their downtown and were aware that other cities had used streetscape surveillance cameras to address similar problems; cities were interested in the use of cameras in their own communities, but because they lacked the necessary funding, camera programs remained idle until the CR and POC grants became available. Once camera advocates became aware of the availability of grant funds, this kicked the camera programs into gear. Cobourg, Cornwall, and Belleville's programs began and Peterborough's was revived after learning of the grants. Orillia unsuccessfully applied for grant funding in the early stages of their camera program, and Quinte West's program began prior to the existence of such grant programs, though subsequent additions have been made possible because of grant funds. Therefore, while many communities knew

about and wanted cameras, these camera programs took off after discovering that grant money was available.

CR and POC Grants Facilitate Faster and Easier Implementation of Camera Systems

Grant-funded systems are established more easily than streetscape systems that are funded locally. Many communities were unable to finance the installation of cameras locally because budgets could not accommodate the start-up costs. When spending local funds was proposed or initiated, community members in a number of cities expressed concerns. Members of the community in Quinte West and Orillia felt the money would be better spent on existing policing initiatives (e.g. street patrols) or more incremental approaches (e.g. better street lighting) and questioned the use of community funds in monitoring the activities of the general public. Participants, particularly those in Cornwall, expressed that having the money sourced externally made it easier to support the implementation of a camera system as there would be no financial impact on their city; participants also felt positively about funding a crime control initiative through the use of funds derived from the proceeds of criminal activity. Participants hypothesized that having to use local funds to implement a camera system would bring more public scrutiny and a “bigger case” would need to be made for cameras – i.e. more in-depth presentations, reports, research, etc. In other words, having externally sourced-funding creates less of a need for the justification of camera systems. The CR and POC grants not only remove the financial impediment to implement a camera system by providing the needed funds, but they also placate concerns about cameras.

Further, the grant not only enabled initial camera systems to be implemented more easily, but it also made funding for enhancements to existing systems easier to obtain. Quinte West and Cornwall used grants for additional enhancements to their systems, while others, such as Belleville felt grants would not be given for camera technology as it was no longer a novel initiative. The former cities felt that additions were easier to obtain as they were often for smaller amounts of money, and that with their past experience in applying for the grant, they could easily fulfil the grant criteria and demonstrate the successes of their current system, assuring grantors of the value of further additions. The latter cities also benefitted from the grant in securing funds for enhancements: participants felt the financial burden for additional cameras was less onerous than the initial grant-funded installation, making it easier for the community to come up with the funds for subsequent additions.

The grant programs also enabled camera systems to be implemented more quickly. Securing the needed funds for camera systems can take considerable time for locally-funded systems, not to mention the many other steps involved in bringing a program to fruition. In contrast, camera programs funded with grant money must spend the money awarded to them and implement their system by the end of the fiscal year. In some cases, this means that grants must be spent within a matter of months, otherwise the funds may be forfeited, as was the case with Quinte West. Additional resources were often utilized to both ensure successful receipt of the grant, as well as to assure the grant funds would be spent and the system operational by the end grant deadline. Cities employed the help of grant writers (Cornwall), consultants (Belleville and Orillia), IT companies (all cities), as well as the assistance of community organizations and

neighbouring cities, in bringing their grant-funded camera systems to a successful result. Ministry employees also regularly consulted with grant recipients, keeping them to a timeline and urging expeditiousness where required.

CR and POC Grants Influence Camera Program Design and Operation

The camera programs in this study are primarily driven through police departments (with the exception of Orillia) as the grant is only available to police organizations. In contrast to other Canadian streetscape systems, where the composition of actors and their motivating reasons for establishing systems are quite diverse (see Hier 2010), police-led camera systems are typically purposed toward crime deterrence and assisting with investigations. While community organizations were involved in the implementation and operation of camera systems, this was mostly in a supportive capacity – either financially or in principle (e.g. community organizations supporting the system). Local organizations often contribute to the operational costs of the system and sometimes make funds available for any needed upgrades and repairs. Financial support from these organizations is desired because police are often unable to put even these smaller items into their budgets, and from the perspective of the organizations, they want to contribute and demonstrate their support monetarily as they recognize that cameras are for their benefit, too. However, police shoulder most of the burden for the program (e.g. funding applications, policy development, operation), and other organizations help facilitate the system by providing funds or services in-kind, or bolster programs with verbal support.

The grant also influenced the design and operation of camera programs through the amount of money given and the purposes it was awarded for. While police relied on crime statistics and their knowledge of the local area and its history to determine where cameras should be used and how many were required, the camera system design was also affected by the amount of funding available. Cities do not always receive as much funding as they request (as was seen with Cornwall's second grant) but also, the amount of funding available through the grant can fluctuate: in some years, the grant funding is capped – for example, one year the CR program was capped at \$30,000, whereas the POC program is capped at \$100,000. The amount of money available to and received by cities translates into the quality of the camera system and the number of cameras they are able to afford.

Further, as the grant program is only intended to fund capital costs – the purchase of camera equipment – it does not provide money for planning or evaluative procedures (e.g. IPC-recommended Privacy Impact Assessments and audits of camera systems, respectively) nor operational costs. This has resulted in cities forgoing some planning processes and evaluations altogether, and operating passively monitored systems. Given the difficulties over funding the purchase of cameras, cities could not afford the high operating costs associated with live monitoring, instead opting for passively monitored systems. Participants also indicated that the use of passively monitored systems was a way to avoid issues with privacy concerns – this was raised with Peterborough in particular, a city who had encountered resistance over privacy in the years prior. Thus, camera design and operation is influenced by the parameters of the grant program as

much as – or in some cases more than – it is by the identified needs and goals of the camera system.

CR and POC Grants Encourage Regional Networking, Policy Learning and Policy Tourism Between Cities

Policy learning and policy tourism were significant to the policymaking processes of the cities in this study. Every city engaged with one or more neighbouring communities in order to learning how to implement, design and operate camera systems, and also to learn how to attain grant funding. While cities also relied on other sources of information (e.g. the IPC Guidelines, internet research, information provided by consultants, local surveys, etc.), the policy learning and policy tourism visits (and the information, advice, policies and applications that were shared during) appear to make up the bulk of the policy research carried out, thus making it one of the primary processes of policymaking in this study. The existing literature on policy literature does not adequately address the policy learning and policy tourism that occurs regionally between communities. This study adds to the literature by focusing on policymaking in smaller communities, demonstrating that policy learning and policy tourism are valuable practices for small cities as they are an efficient and pragmatic way to learn about new policies. Lacking the knowledge and experience themselves, cities felt it was more beneficial and efficient to learn from others who had already been through the process, and policy tourism was pragmatic as it involved visiting nearby cities, required few resources, and any information learned would have practical relevancy.

Efficiency

As one of the first steps in the policymaking process, prospective cities engaged with other established cities early on in order to guide their own system's development. Learning from elsewhere was seen as necessary to make up for the lack of first-hand experience (see also Cook and Ward 2011) in establishing and operating a camera system. Visiting other cities is regarded as highly valuable in the learning process, as policymakers are able to gain that first-hand experience and see for themselves how things work. Rather than reading off of policy documents or press releases, representatives from prospective cities have the opportunity to meet "experts" and ask questions specific to their needs (Wolman and Page 2002). This generates information that is both specific (e.g. operational issues to avoid) as well as broad and abstract (e.g. overarching mandate of the initiative).

The sentiment often expressed as a rationale for utilizing policy learning was that participants did not wish to "reinvent the wheel": "We weren't reinventing the wheel here. I think [the police] went to other agencies or communities that had cameras and looked at their policies and then the city refigured it to fit their needs" (Police participant, Quinte West). Other cities are a model to follow, and the home community "refigures" the model to fit their needs. Particularly as the grant program is a competitive process, it is seen as unwise to reinvent the wheel or to try something new (Cook and Ward 2011); participants wanted to maximize their chances of success by modeling themselves after systems that had already been shown to work.

Pragmatism

Policy tourism is an efficient way to learn about desired policies and programs, but policy tourism that occurs regionally also has a pragmatic aspect, as learning from those in close proximity has practical benefits. Cities often look to their geographic neighbours as a source of learning (Wolman and Page 2002; Rose 2005; Kern et al. 2007; Marsden et al. 2010). This allows policymakers to compare and imagine how a policy will look in a similar setting. The information learned often has more relevance as cities located in the same region/province/nation may have a similar cultural, political and economic climate, and more specifically, be subject to similar legislation and forms of governance (Marsden et al. 2010). Indeed, the cities in this study were not only trying to implement the same crime control initiative, but were also trying to do so using the same funding program. Prospective cities were assured that any information they learned was relevant and applicable to them as they were located in the same region and subject to the same provincial (and federal) legislation, particularly the *IPC Guidelines*.

Another practical consideration that makes regional policy tourism a desirable policymaking practice is the low cost and time commitment. Larger cities are more able and likely to consult others outside of their region because they have the resources to engage in a broader search (Wolman and Page 2002), but for smaller cities and police departments, like the ones in this study, who are often short on resources and under increasingly tight budgets, traveling to nearby cities is relatively inexpensive and expeditious, particularly if only a day trip is required. Some cities expressed their desire to learn from those larger, longer-established cities and benefit from their extra resources (e.g. borrowing from policies that have been examined by a larger, more experienced legal team), thereby reducing their own policymaking burden.

Policymaking and the Diffusion of Streetscape Camera Information

Particular cities were visited or consulted more than others; these were generally the cities with larger, longer established systems (e.g. Sudbury, Toronto, but also Quinte West and Belleville). Quinte West has played a significant role in the transmission of information about camera systems, as they have advised most of the cities in this study. Cities that have learned from Quinte West have also subsequently come to play an important role in the diffusion of information about camera systems: Belleville, who solicited information from Quinte West in the early days of their camera program, is now seen as a valuable source of information for even newer cities; further, Orillia, a city that has learned from both Quinte West and Belleville, has begun to advise subsequent cities looking to establish camera systems. Thus, a diffusion pattern exists among these cities whereby those who have learned from their predecessors “pass the torch” of advice, information and policies to their other prospective cities

What appears to have consistently diffused among cities is applied knowledge about camera technology and system design in order to facilitate functional systems (e.g. systems that are reliable and transmit images without issue, captures and stores good quality images, etc.) and an emphasis on a general ‘spirit’ of privacy protection rather than advocating for particular privacy protection practices that are enshrined in camera policy. Cities appear interested in learning about how to establish and operate systems that will maximally benefit their city’s/police agency’s ability to deter and investigate crime (e.g. placing cameras in troublesome areas or in spots providing maximum coverage of downtown; using reliable technology), and minimally impact the privacy of

the people in their community through design and operation (e.g. using passive monitoring, assuring cameras cannot see into residential areas). Prospective cities' desire to learn about camera technology is fairly obvious, as the technology is somewhat complicated and most camera advocates did not readily possess this information. Thus, they relied on others who had already been through the learning and application process in order to replicate their predecessor's successes and avoid complications or failures. This resulted, for example, in many cities using a different kind of camera system infrastructure than the one used early on in Quinte West, as cities wanted to avoid the operational issues they encountered.

The diffusion of a general emphasis on privacy protection rather than advocating for particular privacy protection practices is less clear. This may be in part due to changing ideas about cameras and privacy. In general, the discourse around privacy and cameras has shifted in recent years where cameras are seen as much less controversial and arguably banal (Goold, Loader and Thumala 2013). Many systems established in earlier years grappled with objections and resistance to cameras on the grounds of privacy (Hier 2010), whereas today the main impediment to establishment is in securing the initial and on-going resources to implement and operate systems. The apparent ubiquity of cameras worldwide, publically and privately, as well as the use of cameras in assisting with high profile events (e.g. terrorist activities, child abductions, etc.), contribute to a sentiment that cameras are now a part of everyday life and they are here to stay. This is not to suggest that privacy no longer matters, but that expectations of privacy have shifted. It is in this context that a move to an emphasis on general privacy protection can be understood. With less of an expectation of privacy in public spaces, there is less

pressure to specify exactly how privacy will be protected. Participants in this study understood privacy protection to mean that the private would not be captured on camera: cameras would neither view residential spaces nor follow the activities of individuals. Thus, privacy would be protected by only viewing what was considered public. The need for specific privacy protection provisions would be unnecessary as the camera system would not view areas or individuals that had an expectation of privacy. In other words, if there is no expectation of privacy, there is less of a need for privacy protection.

The diffusion of a general understanding of privacy protection does not mean that cities did not share information on specific privacy protection practices. Indeed, each city highlighted particular aspects of the *IPC Guidelines* (e.g. the necessity for signage) that they felt were important in their policies. Prospective cities take up and interpret the established policies, but they also have their own understanding of the *Guidelines*. However, the message that consistently diffused among the cities was a need to “protect privacy” and to comply with the *Guidelines* and relevant legislation; the specifics of how to actually do this were mostly left up to communities to interpret and apply themselves.

Indeed, the *IPC Guidelines* remain a significant policy instrument for the planning and design of camera systems, as well as the policies that guide their use. Compliance with the *Guidelines* is a central concern for those implementing systems. Some cities in this study consulted with the IPC office before and/or after creating the system’s policy, asking questions and getting clarification to assure their policies did not conflict with best practices. Other cities did not consult with the IPC as they felt they satisfied the requirements and did not require approval.

Many of the cities felt the recommendations in the *Guidelines* were straightforward; however, there is considerable discrepancy between the policies and programs of each city. In particular, policies varied with regard to signage, image retention periods, community consultations, access to and training on monitoring equipment, evaluations and audits, and demonstrating a need for cameras (i.e. as last resort of incremental approach). This is in part due to cities' different interpretations of unclear and ambiguous recommendations in the *Guidelines*, as well as their selective emphasis on particular provisions. Some participants acknowledged their interpretation of the *Guidelines* but stated that they wanted to err on side of caution to avoid any issues with the Privacy Commissioner. Yet, these same cities' policies did not reflect this conservative approach, with some aspects of their policies having a generous interpretation of particular privacy provisions (for example, the IPC's recommended period for image retention is 72 hours, yet some cities retain from a period of 7 days to 8 months).

In creating their own camera programs and policies, and determining how to protect privacy and comply with legislation, cities drew from the IPC *Guidelines* as well as the advice, information and policy instruments from a number of different cities. Participants noted that they had many different "templates" of policies to choose from, and could pick what they liked and what suited them best. From these policies and the IPC *Guidelines*, cities interpret and "cherry pick" what they feel works best for them.

Although the CR and POC programs influence aspects of camera systems, and the diffusion process enabled by policy learning and policy tourism suggests a potential for the standardization of streetscape camera programs, variation exists in camera system

design and implementation across grant-funded systems, particularly concerning privacy policies. During the policymaking process, prospective cities learn from and selectively adopt the advice and information provided by already-established cities; these cities provided valuable advice with regard to camera technology and system design, and stressed a need to protect privacy generally. While each established city emphasized particular aspects of the *IPC Guidelines* that they felt ensured privacy protection, prospective cities were left to interpret and apply the unclear and ambiguous *IPC Guidelines* themselves. Because prospective cities had different understandings of the *IPC Guidelines* and only took up some parts (and not others) of established cities' policies that they felt would be of benefit, the resulting policies remained diverse rather than becoming more similar. In short, while the CR and POC grants have influenced some similarities in streetscape camera programs, variation still exists due to the policymaking process and the *IPC Guidelines*.

Implications and Recommendations for the CR and POC Grant Programs

Despite the falling crime rate in Canada (Cesaroni and Doob 2003; Brennan 2012; Statistics Canada 2013) and multiple studies demonstrating the lack of camera effectiveness in preventing or solving crimes (Pawson and Tilley 1994; Ditton et al. 1999; Ditton and Short 1999; Armitage 2002; Welsh and Farrington 2002, 2003, 2009; Töpfer and Hempel 2004), cities across Canada continue to advocate for and implement camera systems. Cameras are considered an effective policing tool and are expected to be a part of everyday life and policing (see also Goold et al. 2013):

I think cameras are going to become more and more vital part of our day to day operation. That's just the way it is, whether it be for security, whether it

be for patrol, for cruisers and stuff like that, it's just, it's going to be the way it is (Council Member, Belleville).

The CR and POC grants are one way that a number of Canadian streetscape camera systems have been and continue to be established and expanded. While two cities in this study had unsuccessful grant applications, at least ten camera programs have successfully received grant funds (sometimes more than once) for their camera systems and many more continue to apply for the grant. Grantors see cameras as effective tools for crime prevention but note that camera technology is expensive (Civil Remedies Committee Minutes 2012) and have awarded funds for camera initiatives each year.

The implications of the CR and POC grants are that they may contribute to a greater number of camera systems being established or expanded more quickly by police agencies, systems which share some similar aspects of monitoring practices and system design, but continue to have variation in privacy protection policy. It is reasonable to expect that camera programs will continue to receive funding from these grant programs, and as such, municipal and provincial regulatory bodies should engage in greater involvement in order to promote progressive best practices.

Revising the IPC Guidelines

Echoing Hier's recommendations (2010), first and foremost, the privacy policy sector should revise the *Guidelines* in order to build on some of the progressive trends and to reduce variation. A number of provisions in the *Guidelines* are based on privacy protection legislation, however, not all are clear nor are they regularly enforced. Existing and future empirical research on streetscape camera programs in Canada can be drawn from in creating more robust privacy recommendations, based on the experiences of what

is needed and what works. Hier argues further for a multi-tiered system of camera surveillance privacy protection based on endorsement (where privacy commissioners “approve” of systems that meet privacy protection requirements), where camera proponents/operators and privacy commissioners are actively involved in ensuring adherence to fair information principles (2010). With more comprehensive recommendations and more proactive involvement from the privacy policy sector, there would be less discrepancies and variations in the privacy protection practices. Cities would not only have clear, instructive guidelines to follow when establishing their own systems, but these practices would be strengthened and reinforced through the promotion and diffusion of established cities’ privacy protection policies (which reflect the revised *Guidelines*) to other prospective cities. While cities would still selectively adopt aspects of their neighbour’s policies, the revised *Guidelines* would leave little room for interpretation of privacy protection protocols and practices; thus, any variation in camera programs would not detrimentally affect privacy but would rather be a reflection of local needs.

Introducing Best Practices through the Grant Programs

The grant process itself may be an opportunity to promote best practice and introduce some regulation to grant-funded streetscape systems. Specifically, the grant application process and the reporting procedures for successful recipients could be amended to encourage well-planned and executed initiatives. As the grant is intended for a number of crime prevention or remediation initiatives, the grant application process is generalized and does not focus on provisions specific to camera programs. The

application asks for information on the police agency and the community; it asks applicants to detail their proposed initiative, how it meets the purposes of the grant program and its expected impact, including the amount of funding they are requesting; applicants are asked about their sustainability plan post-grant, and how they will fulfill their commitments to Ministry regarding reporting and evaluations (e.g. measurable goals and how they will be met). A review of the applications reveals that the information provided in support for camera programs varies considerably with respect to content and scope (e.g. some provide very little information whereas others are more detailed) and minimal references are made to the privacy protection practices which are inevitably linked to the use of cameras. The application thus has limited capabilities to ask initiative-specific questions that can help grantors determine the efficacy and viability of proposed programs. A number of additional questions could be asked in the application which would require grantees to provide more information about their proposed initiative, which would help not only with camera programs but other initiatives as well. Grantees could be asked to: provide adequate evidence that their proposed initiative has been effective and that it is appropriate for whatever it is being used for (i.e. it is the right tool for the job); demonstrate that grantees have engaged in sufficient research to plan and carry out their proposed initiative; and grantees have consulted with relevant legislation and have a plan to ensure compliance once the initiative is operational.

Requiring more initiative-specific information in the grant would serve two purposes: better informed grantsmaking decisions and better planned and executed initiatives. First, providing grant evaluators with more specific information would be beneficial as often the review committee members may not possess detailed knowledge

(or any knowledge at all) about a proposed initiative. Further, there are no resources put in place or any expectation for evaluators to vet or conduct research on the proposed initiative. This could result in evaluators giving the green light to initiatives that have elsewhere been shown to be ineffective. Second, these applications become the basis of the contract between the grantees and the Ministry. A contract is created based on the information provided in the application, and grantees agree to the purpose of the grant, how it will be spent, and to commit to producing regular reports on expenditures and outcomes (more on this below). Thus, more detailed grant applications can later become more detailed grant contracts, whereby continued funding is contingent on upholding the agreement. For example, the application could require a grantee to detail how their initiative adheres to relevant legislation and their funding would be contingent on them following through on that compliance.

Finally, one area that both the cities and the ministries have consistently missed opportunities with is in the reporting of the grant program. As a condition of the grant program, recipients are required to report to the Ministries on their expenditures as well as whether and how they achieved their initiative's objectives. The grantees often provided clear accounting and rationales for their expenditures, but the final reports where grantees presented their program's success (or lack thereof) was neither robust nor definitive. For example, one city simply re-stated what was proposed in the application, which was that cameras "*will* provide an added sense of safety while at the same time reduce the chances of being victimized" (emphasis added). Cities were unable to definitively state the outcome of their camera programs, presumably because very little, if any, empirical evaluations of their camera system had been produced. The grant

guidelines ask grantees to explain how the project will be measured to demonstrate successes, using targets and outcomes, and suggest that grantees include surveys or testimonials to show how the initiative has been of benefit, leaving grantees to determine the nature of reporting. Not only are the reporting requirements minimally prescriptive in content, there are no mechanisms in place on the part of the Ministries to evaluate or act on the reports, nor can the Ministries ensure that program evaluations take place at all (as in the case where grantees report on what their systems *will* do in the future). In other words, it is left up to the grantee to decide how to evaluate programs and whether or not they actually do it, and the Ministry can do little more than file away whatever kind of “reporting” they receive back.

As shown above, the grant process as it currently stands has a number of shortfalls which could be addressed by the granting ministries to strengthen both their own programs as well as the initiatives they fund. Further, given that a number of camera systems have been funded through these grant programs, the IPC could coordinate with the funding Ministries to help them vet and evaluate grantee’s applications and reports as well as providing more specific information to grantees on how to plan and evaluate systems.

The Implications of the Role of Grants in General

While the influence and outcomes of the CR and POC grants on streetscape camera programs is important, it is also necessary to consider the role of grants in policing and for crime policymaking in general. The use of grants for the establishment of camera systems occurs in a context where grants *in general* are increasingly used by

police agencies as a way to finance crime control initiatives in the face of tighter budgets. It has become something of a truism that public service budgets are incredibly limited, and police budgets in particular are certainly not exempt. The cost of policing in Canada continues to rise. From 2000-2005, aggregate police spending for provincial and municipal governments increased 37%, compared to a 17% increase from 1995-2000 (Murphy 2007). In 2011, total police spending was at an all-time high of \$12.9 billion (Statistics Canada 2013) (note that controlling for inflation, spending actually declined 1%, the first time since 1996). While more money is spent on police services and there are more police officers and personnel than ever before (Statistics Canada 2013), there are actually fewer police officers relative to population size (Cooley 2005:8-9) and they are tasked with providing more services than before (Cooley 2005; Murphy 2007). It is oft-repeated by police and community that budgets are tight (Potter 2011; Kempa 2013) and as such, police are “confronted with inexorable political demands to find ways to cut costs, increase efficiency, improve productivity and demonstrate what is called “value for money” (Murphy 2004: n.p.; see also Lithopolous and Rigakos 2005); they must find a way to increase the services they provide while decreasing their financial burden.

One of the ways police have attempted address these difficulties is by reducing existing services. More commonly, however, agencies attempt to find alternative and novel ways to deliver services by looking to technology to “either enhanc[e] or replac[e] in-person police activities” (Murphy 2004: n.p.). New, cutting-edge crime control initiatives are considered a way to address the increasing demand put onto police, as well as a way to reduce policing costs. For example, technology is seen as a cost-effective way to target and reduce crime, as it can supplement or replace activities that would otherwise

be carried out but police staff without requiring the associated human resource costs. However, often these new initiatives – particularly technology-based initiatives – are expensive to start up. Police have subsequently sought external funds from elsewhere to help finance particular initiatives they feel would benefit their service and the community as their budgets are unable to accommodate any extra expenditure. These external funds come primarily in the form of money given through provincial grant programs. Indeed, in a context of tight public budgets and a need to utilize cost-effective technologies to address on-going community issues, the availability of grant programs to fund initiatives is not only attractive, but indeed, vital to the ability to implement new approaches.

Grants are becoming an integral part of the funding conglomeration which makes up police budgets (Coe and Wiesel 2001); grants have been increasingly used to fund police activities, particularly to finance novel initiatives (Crank and Langworthy 1996). Of course, grant success cannot be guaranteed, nor can police agencies predict whether their proposed initiatives will fit into the identified priority areas, making it a problematic revenue source to rely on. Police organizations must perform a delicate balancing act, determining where they feel their efforts are best focused in trying to secure funding by engaging in a calculation of what they feel is most likely to be funded, and with which source of money. For example, some of this study's participants felt cameras were now considered a *passé* initiative and would not apply for cameras at the risk of "jeopardizing" another program they felt may be more likely to get funded. Indeed, some participants felt that having the grant allowed them to put forward initiatives they would have had difficulty putting into their own budget (see also Crank and Langworthy 1996), and by having the cameras financed from elsewhere, they were able to focus their budget

on other initiatives that would not/could not be financed by grants. Thus, grants are seen as additional pots of money that can be utilized to offset budgetary burdens and facilitate a “wish list” of initiatives not easily covered by their own budget. Even for agencies who have designated money set aside for cameras (e.g. Quinte West, Cobourg), these grants are seen as worth pursuing to as it avoids taking money from their own community, and the money “saved” could be put toward other initiatives on their “wish list” (e.g. patrol cars, building renovations).

While the receipt of grant funds is often considered a boon to police agencies and the communities that are served by them, grant funds can introduce new challenges and unforeseen implications. In particular, grants may influence or direct crime control policies, encounter issues of financial sustainability, and create additional responsibilities. Law enforcement grants are typically given for new crime control initiatives, and can result in areas of specialization as police organizations conform to specific funding guidelines. Not only may this result in influencing the crime control policies of a department (e.g. pursuing one approach that is funded over another that is not) (Fussey 2007; Owens 2007), it may also result in a fragmented approach to policing, where programs are pursued that contradict existing police practices (Crank and Langworthy 1996). Further, the use of grant funds introduces challenges for initiative sustainability. Some authors have noted that once the grant funding is used up, agencies may have difficulty continuing to operate their chosen initiative; initiatives may require operating costs that go beyond the capability of departments to fund, or they may fail all together to anticipate such costs (Crank and Langworthy 1996; Coe and Weisel 2001: 725). Indeed, there are a number of responsibilities, obligations and considerations that grant funds

trigger (Oettmeier 2002), not all of which are adequately addressed by the successful recipient(s). This can result in haphazard, ill-informed and poorly executed programs.

In short, it appears that grants are increasingly used by police agencies to address budgetary restrictions and introduce novel approaches to controlling crime. However, research suggests that police often pay limited attention to the ways grant programs may affect and influence the particular initiatives they pursue and can introduce other unforeseen financial and organizational burdens.

Concluding Remarks

The Civil Remedies and Proceeds of Crime grants have aided in the establishment and operation of a number of streetscape camera systems in Ontario. While these grants encourage some similarities in camera programs, variation still exists due to the *IPC Guidelines* and the policymaking processes. Although the policies and programs that result from policy learning and policy tourism will always reflect selective, idiosyncratic interpretations of lessons learned from elsewhere, progressive trends in camera system design and privacy protection policy can be fostered through revisions to the existing privacy protection framework – namely, the *IPC Guidelines* – and amendments to the CR and POC grant process. The use of grants for cameras and the use of grants for policing initiatives in general is unlikely to cease, and as such, streetscape camera operators and regulators need to become aware of the ways in which camera programs are influenced by such grant programs, and proactively work to ensure the use of camera systems is to the benefit of their community as a whole.

Bibliography

- Anderson, James E. 2010. *Public Policymaking: An Introduction*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Armitage, Rachel. 2002. *To CCTV Or Not to CCTV? A Review of Current Research into the Effectiveness of CCTV Systems in Reducing Crime*. London: NACRO.
- Attride-Stirling, Jennifer. 2001. "Thematic Networks: An Analytic Tool for Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Research* 1 (3):385-405.
- Ball, Kirstie and Frank Webster. 2003. *The Intensification of Surveillance: Crime, Terrorism and Warfare in the Information Era*. London: Pluto Press.
- Bannister, Jon, Nicholas Fyfe, and Ade Kearns. 1998. "Closed Circuit Television and the City." Pp. 21-41 in *Surveillance, Closed Circuit Television, and Social Control* edited by C. Norris, J. Moran, and G. Armstrong. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Bayley, David H. and Clifford D. Shearing. 1996. "The Future of Policing." *Law and Society Review* 30 (3):585-606.
- Béland, Daniel. 2009. "Ideas, Institutions, and Policy Change." *Journal of European Public Policy* 16 (5):701-718.
- Bennett, Colin J. 2003. "The Privacy Commissioner of Canada: Multiple Roles, Diverse Expectations and Structural Dilemmas." *Canadian Public Administration* 46 (2):218-242.
- Bennett, Colin J. and Michael Howlett. 1992. "The Lessons of Learning: Reconciling Theories of Policy Learning and Policy Change." *Policy Sciences* 25 (3):275-94.
- Benz, Arthur and Dietrich Fürst. 2002. "Policy Learning in Regional Networks." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 9 (1):21-35.
- Berry, Frances Stokes and William D. Berry. 1999. "Innovation and Diffusion Models in Policy Research" in *Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy*, edited by P.A. Sabatier. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.
- Boeije, Hennie. 2002. "A Purposeful Approach to the Constant Comparative Method in the Analysis of Qualitative Interviews." *Quality & Quantity* 36 (4):391-409.
- Boyatzis, Richard E. 1998. *Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Braun, Virginia and Victoria Clarke. 2006. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3 (2):77-101.
- Brennan, Shannon. 2012. "Police-Reported Crime Statistics in Canada, 2011." Ottawa: Statistics Canada. (<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11692-eng.htm>)
- Cavoukian, Ann. 2007. "Guidelines for the use of Video Surveillance Cameras in Public Places." Toronto: Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario. (<http://www.ipc.on.ca/English/Resources/Discussion-Papers/Discussion-Papers-Summary/?id=647>)
- Cesaroni, Carla and Anthony N. Doob. 2003. "The Decline in Support for Penal Welfarism. Evidence of Support among the Elite for Punitive Segregation." *British Journal of Criminology* 43 (2):434-441.
- Coe, Charles K. and Deborah Lamm Wiesel. 2001. Police Budgeting: Winning Strategies." *Public Administration Review* 61 (6):718-727.
- Coleman, Roy. 2003. "Images from a Neoliberal City: The State, Surveillance and Social Control." *Critical Criminology* 12 (1):21-42.
- . 2005. "Surveillance in the City: Primary Definition and Urban Spatial Order." *Crime, Media, Culture* 1 (2):131-148.
- Coleman, Roy and Joe Sim. 2000. "'You'll Never Walk Alone': CCTV Surveillance, Order and Neoliberal Rule in Liverpool City Centre." *The British Journal of Sociology* 51 (4):623-639.
- . 1998. "From the Dockyards to the Disney Store: Surveillance, Risk and Security in Liverpool City Centre." *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* 12 (1):27-45.
- Cook, Ian R. and Kevin Ward. 2011. "Trans-Urban Networks of Learning, Mega Events and Policy Tourism the Case of Manchester's Commonwealth and Olympic Games Projects." *Urban Studies* 48 (12):2519-2535.
- Cooley, D. 2005. *Re-Imagining Policing in Canada*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Crank, John and Robert Langworthy. 1996. "Fragmented Centralization and the Organization of the Police." *Policing and Society: An International Journal* 6 (3):213-229.
- Dey, Ian. 1993. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York: Routledge.

- Ditton, Jason, Emma Short, Samuel Phillips, Clive Norris and Gary Armstrong. 1999. *The Effect of Closed Circuit Television on Recorded Crime Rates and Public Concern about Crime in Glasgow*. The Scottish Office Central Research Unit.
- Ditton, Jason and Emma Short. 1999. "Yes, It Works, No, It Doesn't: Comparing the Effects of Open-Street CCTV in Two Adjacent Scottish Town Centres." *Crime Prevention Studies* 10:371-403.
- Dixon-Woods, Mary, Shona Agarwal, David Jones, Bridget Young, and Alex Sutton. 2005. "Synthesising Qualitative and Quantitative Evidence: A Review of Possible Methods." *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy* 10 (1):45-53B.
- Dolowitz, David and David Marsh. 2000. "Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making." *Governance* 13 (1):5-23.
- Dolowitz, David and David Marsh. 1996. "Who Learns what from Whom: A Review of the Policy Transfer Literature." *Political Studies* 44 (2):343-57.
- Fereday, Jennifer and Eimear Muir-Cochrane. 2008. "Demonstrating Rigor using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 5 (1):80-92.
- Fussey, Pete. 2007. "An Interrupted Transmission? Processes of CCTV Implementation and the Impact of Human Agency." *Surveillance & Society* 4 (3):229-256.
- Fyfe, Nicholas. R. and Jon Bannister. 1996. "City Watching: Closed Circuit Television Surveillance in Public Spaces." *Area* 28 (1):37-46.
- Garland, David. 1996. "The Limits of the Sovereign State Strategies of Crime Control in Contemporary Society." *British Journal of Criminology* 36 (4):445-471.
- González, Sara. 2011. "Bilbao and Barcelona 'In Motion'. How Urban Regeneration 'Models' Travel and Mutate in the Global Flows of Policy Tourism." *Urban Studies* 48 (7):1397-1418.
- Goold, Benjamin. 2004. *Closed-Circuit Television and Policing: Public Area Surveillance and Police Practices in Britain*. Oxford University Press.
- Goold, Benjamin, Ian Loader, and Angélica Thumala. 2013. "The Banality of Security the Curious Case of Surveillance Cameras." *British Journal of Criminology* 53 (6):977-996.
- Hays, Scott P. 1996. "Patterns of Reinvention: The Nature of Evolution during Policy Diffusion." *Policy Studies Journal* 24 (4):551-566.

- Hier, Sean P. 2004. "Risky Spaces and Dangerous Faces: Urban Surveillance, Social Disorder and CCTV." *Social & Legal Studies* 13 (4):541-554.
- . 2010. *Panoptic Dreams: Streetscape Video Surveillance in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Hier, Sean P., Josh Greenberg, Kevin Walby, and Dan Lett. 2007. "Media, Communication and the Establishment of Public Camera Surveillance Programmes in Canada." *Media, Culture & Society* 29 (5):727-751.
- Hier, Sean P. and Kevin Walby. 2011. "Privacy Pragmatism and Streetscape Video Surveillance in Canada." *International Sociology* 26 (6):844-861.
- Hier, Sean P. and Kevin Walby. 2014. "Policy Mutations, Compliance Myths, and Redeployable Special Event Public Camera Surveillance in Canada." *Sociology* 48 (1):150-166.
- Hier, Sean P., Kevin Walby, and Josh Greenberg. 2006. "Supplementing the Panoptic Paradigm: Surveillance, Moral Governance and CCTV." Pp. 23-45 in *Theorizing the Panopticon and Beyond*, edited by D. Lyon. Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Hoyt, Lorlene. 2006. "Importing Ideas: The Transnational Transfer of Urban Revitalization Policy." *International Journal of Public Administration* 29 (1-3):221-243.
- Johnson, Matthew. 2012. "Is it a 'Search'? The Legal Context of Camera Surveillance in Canada." Pp. 333-354 in *Eyes Everywhere: The Global Growth of Camera Surveillance*, edited by A. Doyle, R. Lippert, and D. Lyon. New York: Routledge.
- Jones, Trevor, and Tim Newburn. 2007. *Policy Transfer and Criminal Justice*. McGraw-Hill International.
- Kempa, Michael. 2013. "The Exploding Cost of Policing in Canada." *CBC*, January 15. (<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/the-exploding-cost-of-policing-in-canada-1.1330251>)
- Kern, Kristine, Claudia Koll, and Malte Schophaus. 2007. "The Diffusion of Local Agenda 21 in Germany: Comparing the German Federal States." *Environmental Politics* 16 (4):604-624.
- Lincoln, Yvonna. S. and Egon G. Guba. 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Lithopoulos, Savvas, and George S. Rigakos. 2005. "Neo-Liberalism, Community, and Police Regionalization in Canada: A Critical Empirical Analysis." *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 28 (2):337-352.
- Lyon, David. 2001. *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- . 2007. "Surveillance, Security and Social Sorting Emerging Research Priorities." *International Criminal Justice Review* 17 (3):161-170.
- Mackay, David. 2003. "Multiple Targets: The Reasons to Support Town-Centre CCTV Systems." *Crime Prevention and Community Safety* 5 (3):39-48.
- Marsden, Greg, Karen Trapenberg Frick, Anthony D. May, and Elizabeth Deakin. 2011. "How do Cities Approach Policy Innovation and Policy Learning? A Study of 30 Policies in Northern Europe and North America." *Transport Policy* 18 (3):501-512.
- Marsh, David., and Rod A. W. Rhodes. 1992. *Policy Networks in British Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mauthner, Natasha S., Odette Parry, and Kathryn Backett-Milburn. 1998. "The Data are Out there, Or are they? Implications for Archiving and Revisiting Qualitative Data." *Sociology* 32 (4):733-745.
- McCahill, Mike and Clive Norris. 2002. "CCTV in Britain." In: *On the Threshold to Urban Panopticon?: Analysing the Employment of CCTV in European Cities and Assessing its Social and Political Impacts*. Urban Eye. Technical University Berlin: Centre for Technology and Society.
- McCahill, Mike. 2002. *The Surveillance Web*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.
- McCann, Eugene. 2008. "Expertise, Truth, and Urban Policy Mobilities: Global Circuits of Knowledge in the Development of Vancouver, Canada's 'Four Pillar' Drug Strategy." *Environment and Planning* 40 (4):885.
- . 2011. "Urban Policy Mobilities and Global Circuits of Knowledge: Toward a Research Agenda." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 101 (1):107-130.
- Ministry of the Attorney General. 2007. "Civil Forfeiture in Ontario: An Update on the Civil Remedies Act, 2001." (http://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/english/about/pubs/20070824_CRIA_Update.pdf)
- Moran, Rhett A., and David S. Butler. 2001. "Whose Health Profile?" *Critical Public Health* 11 (1):59-74.

- Moran-Ellis, Jo, Victoria D. Alexander, Ann Cronin, Mary Dickinson, Jane Fielding, Judith Sleney, and Hilary Thomas. 2006. "Triangulation and Integration: Processes, Claims and Implications." *Qualitative Research* 6 (1):45-59.
- Mossberger, Karen, and Harold Wolman. 2003. "Policy Transfer as a Form of Prospective Policy Evaluation: Challenges and Recommendations." *Public Administration Review* 63 (4):428-440.
- Murphy, Christopher. 2007. "'Securitizing' Canadian Policing: A New Policing Paradigm for the Post 9/11 Security State?" *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 32 (4):449-475.
- . 2004. "The Rationalization of Canadian Public Policing: A Study of the Impact and Implications of Resource Limits and Market Strategies." *The Canadian Review of Policing Research* 1
- Norris, Clive and Gary Armstrong. 1999. *The Maximum Surveillance Society: The Rise of CCTV*. Oxford; New York: Berg.
- Norris, Clive, Mike McCahill, and David Wood. 2004. "Editorial. the Growth of CCTV: A Global Perspective on the International Diffusion of Video Surveillance in Publicly Accessible Space." *Surveillance & Society* 2 (2/3):110-135.
- Oettmeier, Timothy N. 2002. "The Pursuit of Grants Provides Policy Challenges for Police Executives." *Criminology & Public Policy* 2 (1):43-50.
- Owens, Emily. 2007. "The Government Regulation of Illicit Behaviour." PhD Dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.
- Patton, Michael Quinn 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Pawson, Ray and Nick Tilley. 1994. "What Works in Evaluation Research?" *British Journal of Criminology* 34 (3):291-306.
- Peck, Jamie and Nik Theodore. 2010. "Mobilizing Policy: Models, Methods, and Mutations." *Geoforum* 41 (2):169-174.
- Potter, Mitch. 2011. "Police Budgets: The Thinning Blue Line." *The Toronto Star*, June 3.
(http://www.thestar.com/news/insight/2011/06/03/police_budgets_the_thinning_blue_line.html)
- Ritchie, Jane, Jane Lewis and Gillian Elam. 2003. "Designing and Selecting Samples." Pp. 77-108 in *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students*

and Researchers, edited by J. Lewis, and J. Ritchie. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.

Ritchie, Jane, Liz Spencer and William O'Connor. 2003. "Carrying Out Qualitative Analysis." Pp. 220-262 in *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, edited by J. Lewis, and J. Ritchie. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.

Rose, Richard. 1993. *Lesson-Drawing in Public Policy: A Guide to Learning Across Time and Space*. Chatham, N.J: Chatham House Publishers.

———. 2005. *Learning from Comparative Public Policy: A Practical Guide* New York: Routledge.

Ryan, Gery W. and H. Russell Bernard. 2003. "Techniques to Identify Themes." *Field Methods* 15 (1):85-109.

Sandelowski, Margarete. 2000. "Focus on research methods-whatever happened to qualitative description?" *Research in Nursing and Health* 23 (4): 334-340.

———. 1994. "Focus on Qualitative Methods. The Use of Quotes in Qualitative Research." *Research in Nursing & Health* 17 (6):479-482.

Sheldon, Trevor. 2004. "Learning from Abroad Or Policy Tourism?" *British Journal of General Practice* 54 (503):410-411.

Spencer, Liz, Jane Ritchie and William O'Connor. 2003. "Analysis: Practices, Principles and Processes." Pp. 199-218 in *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, edited by J. Lewis, and J. Ritchie. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.

Statistics Canada. 2011a. "Belleville Census Profile." 2013 (Oct 20):

———. 2011b. "Cobourg Census Profile." 2013 (Oct 20):

———. 2011c. "Cornwall Census Profile." 2013 (Oct 20):

———. 2011d. "Orillia Census Profile." 2013 (Oct 20):

———. 2011e. "Peterborough Census Profile." 2013 (Oct 20):

———. 2011f. "Quinte West Census Profile." 2013 (Oct 20):

- Statistics Canada. 2013. "Police Resources in Canada: 2012." Ottawa: Statistics Canada. (<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-225-x/85-225-x2012000-eng.htm>).
- Stone, Diane. 2004. "Transfer Agents and Global Networks in the 'Transnationalization' of Policy." *Journal of European Public Policy* 11 (3):545-566.
- Töpfer, Eric and Leon Hempel. 2004. "CCTV in Europe - Final Report." In: *On the Threshold to Urban Panopticon?: Analysing the Employment of CCTV in European Cities and Assessing its Social and Political Impacts*. Technical University Berlin: Centre for Technology and Society.
- Walby, Kevin. 2005. "How Closed-Circuit Television Surveillance Organizes the Social: An Institutional Ethnography." *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 30 (2):189-214.
- Walby, Kevin. 2006. "Little England? The Rise of Open-Street Closed-Circuit Television Surveillance in Canada." *Surveillance & Society* 4 (1/2):29-51.
- Webster, William. 2004. "The Diffusion, Regulation and Governance of Closed-Circuit Television in the UK." *Surveillance & Society* 2 (2/3):230-50.
- . 2009. "CCTV Policy in the UK: Reconsidering the Evidence Base." *Surveillance and Society* 6 (1):10-22.
- Welsh, Brandon and David Farrington. 2002. "Crime Prevention Effects of Closed Circuit Television: A Systematic Review." Home Office Research Study 252.
- . 2003. "Effects of Closed-Circuit Television on Crime." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 587 (1):110-135.
- . 2009. "Public Area CCTV and Crime Prevention: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta - Analysis." *Justice Quarterly* 26 (4):716-745.
- Wengraf, Tom. 2001. *Qualitative Research Interviewing: Biographic Narrative and Semi-Structured Methods*. London; Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Wolman, Harold and Ed Page. 2002. "Policy Transfer among Local Governments: An Information–Theory Approach." *Governance* 15 (4):577-501.

Appendix 1

Thematic Summary

Themes of the Study²¹

Global Theme #1: Many arguments are raised in support of cameras

Organizing themes:

- Cameras seen as a way to address on-going issues
 - o Awareness of the use and reported successes of cameras elsewhere for a number of purposes (e.g. crime prevention, investigative purposes, anti-social behaviour, perception of safety, anecdotal “success stories”,)
- Cameras seen as ubiquitous and no longer a novel or controversial initiative
 - o A belief that public and private cameras are everywhere and accepted (e.g. camera ubiquity, private cameras, camera novelty, “nothing wrong, nothing to hide”, privacy concerns)
- Cameras seen as a cost-effective crime technology
 - o Cost of cameras high initially but produce cost-efficient returns on investment compared to uniformed police (e.g. cost-savings of cameras, camera vs. officer, cameras 24/7, faster responses)

Global Theme #2: Grants enable faster and easier implementation of streetscape camera systems

Organizing themes:

- Grants provide needed funds for cameras
 - o Difficulty sourcing community funds (e.g. budgets tight, funding issues, community cost-sharing)
 - o Grant funding important (e.g. provincial grant reference, grant success, grant failure, grant facilitated)
- Grants placate concerns over spending local money, privacy concerns, concerns over efficacy

²¹ **Example of Layout of Global, Organizing, Basic Themes and Codes**

Global Theme X: Global theme is described

Organizing themes:

- Organizing theme Y
 - o Basic theme Y1 (examples of codes for basic theme Y1)
 - o Basic theme Y2 (examples of codes for basic theme Y2)
- Organizing theme Z
 - o Basic theme Z1 (examples of codes for basic theme Z1)
 - o Basic theme Z2 (examples of codes for basic theme Z1)

- Availability of grants makes lobbying for cameras easier (e.g. positive view of grant money, presentations/reports, camera research, privacy concerns, proper use of cameras, negatives of cameras, public resistance)
- Camera programs are established more quickly
 - Rapid deployment of cameras under grants due to tight timelines (e.g. provincial grant, grant application)
 - Securing and fulfilling grant requirements encourages utilization of additional resources (e.g. additional resources, grant-writers, consulting firms)

Global Theme #3: Grants influence the design and operation of camera systems

Organizing themes:

- Grant-funded camera systems are passively monitored, not well researched or evaluated
 - Grants only provide capital funds (no money for live monitoring, planning or evaluations) (e.g. on-going operation costs, monitoring purposes, camera research, anecdotal “success stories”, difficulty demonstrating prevention, evaluations and statistics)
- Grants only available to police; are crime/law enforcement oriented.
 - Police are holders of the initiative due to funding source and expertise (provincial grant, police strategic plan, police budget and resources, police-led system, expertise)
 - Other community organizations are involved with camera systems, but only in a supportive capacity (community support, community cost-sharing, collaborating with community organizations)
- The amount of money given through the grants determines the size and quality of camera systems.
 - Grant funding fluctuates and amount requested not always given in full (e.g. provincial grant, system quality, camera locations, ministry communication)
 - Money for enhancements often sought and easier to get (e.g. system growth, program enhancement)

Global Theme #4: Grants encourage regional networking, policy learning and policy tourism between cities

Organizing theme:

- Cities rely on each other to learn how to successfully operate and fund camera programs
 - Cities visit each other for information about camera technology, policies and grants; cities demonstrate a diffusion pattern where information passed down to successors (e.g. provincial grant, grant application, visiting neighbouring community with cameras, learning from negative lessons, camera research, policy sharing)
 - The IPC Guidelines continue to influence camera design and policy (e.g. privacy legislation, OIPC, privacy concerns, camera policy)
-

Appendix 2

Participant Consent Form

Grant Funding of Streetscape Camera Systems in Ontario

You are being invited to participate in a study entitled Grant Funding of Streetscape Camera Systems in Ontario. The study is being conducted by Denise Mahon, a Master's student at the University of Victoria. This study is part of an on-going research program on streetscape surveillance systems across Canada. This study will be carried out under the supervision of Drs. Kevin Walby and Sean Hier. Dr. Hier is an Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology, University of Victoria. Dr. Walby is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology, University of Victoria.

Recently there has been an increase in the number of streetscape camera surveillance systems across Canada. A number of new city camera systems have been established with the assistance and financial support provided by provincial grant programs. The purpose of this study is to understand the processes involved in securing provincial government money to establish and operate camera systems in Ontario. We are interested in the application process for the grant money; receipt and use of government funds; additional and ongoing funding; camera system establishment - how monitoring technologies (e.g. cameras, monitors, recording equipment) are designed and used; geographical areas under surveillance; city demographics informing system establishment and monitoring practices; organizational layout of monitoring facilities; administrative design (e.g. terms of use, privacy impact assessments, incident reports, logbooks, access restrictions); supervisory and management structure; daily uses of monitoring systems; monitoring practices/applications; police or security practices; use of regulatory committees; and interactions/consultations with the public and/or media.

The study is funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

The study involves three primary components. The first component is semi-structured interviews. All interviews will be recorded. I am not interested in representing personal opinions, but rather understanding the processes involved in negotiating and acquiring government funding and assistance for the establishment of city camera systems.

Interviews will involve an open-ended discussion about grant programs and camera surveillance systems, and they will be recorded using a digital recorder. Interviews will last anywhere from 15 minutes to 1 hour. Copies of the audio files will be uploaded to a computer. The computer is password protected. Digital files will be saved for a period of approximately 5 years. At no time will digital copies of the interviews be shared with or used by anyone other than the researcher or the supervisory committee. The results of the research will be presented in a completed thesis, academic publications and/or at scholarly presentations.

The second component involves observations. Observations of monitoring facilities will entail recording the physical layout of monitoring stations (e.g. number of cameras, location of operators, proximity of camera operators to managers) and the organizational dynamics (e.g. monitoring protocols, hierarchical command structures). Part of the observations will involve informal contact with monitoring and managerial staff to understand how camera systems have been established and how they are used in daily practice.

The third component involves a review of relevant documents and written materials. These documents include:

- MoU/MoAs between your and other organizations
- Internal communications relevant to the grant program(s) (e.g. memos, emails, meeting minutes, presentations, etc.)
- Internal communications relevant to the city's camera program (e.g. memos, emails, meeting minutes, presentations, etc.)
- Governance documents on the city's camera program (e.g. documents related to procedures, best practices, terms of use, reports, budgets, etc.)
- Documentation related to the funding application: the application itself and any drafts, any supporting documentation (e.g. required research, proposed budgets, timelines, quarterly reports, etc.)
- Past and present strategic plans of your organization
- Public communications for the city's camera system (e.g. flyers, news articles, press releases, etc.)

Ideally document review will involve duplicate copies, whether electronically or by photocopying where possible; otherwise, I will request to review documents on-site in the form of recorded notes. In the process of reviewing all documents, the participants will be invited to remove or black out information deemed sensitive (if applicable). The majority of reviewing activity will be done during the location visit, though additional documents may be pursued in follow-up communications (for example, if documents were not available at the time of the visit).

Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time without explanation or consequence. This means that you may terminate your participation at anytime during the course of research. If you choose to terminate your participation, you will be given the option of having all of the information you revealed (including observations and information contained in documents) removed from the study.

The information gathered from the study will not be attributed to specific statements or opinions you make. It is important to point out that I cannot guarantee the full confidentiality, however. I will make every effort to ensure confidentiality. I will do so by only using information that is absolutely necessary to achieve the research goals.

Confidentiality is limited to the extent that the identity of participants (e.g. a site manager) could be inferred by outside readers. Confidentiality is also limited within the

research site. It is possible that other employees will know who participated in the study. Participants may request the use of a pseudonym.

Participation requires time devoted to research in the workplace. It is possible that some participants (e.g. a member of an oversight committee) will grant personal time to an interview, thus being willingly inconvenienced by the research.

This research represents an important and original contribution to knowledge for several reasons. The availability and application of grant funds for the design and establishment of Canadian streetscape camera systems is growing. It is important to understand this novel development and how this relates to best practices in streetscape camera surveillance.

The findings to emerge from the project will be of interest to several communities: scholars interested in surveillance and social problems from a variety of disciplines (sociology, mass communication, policy studies, criminology, and political science); civil liberties researchers and advocates; and policymakers. The findings will also be of interest to the general public. I do not believe that there are serious risks posed by participating in the study.

If you have any questions about any part of the research, you are encouraged to ask either myself or my supervisory committee.

This project has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Board at the University of Victoria. This Committee regulates the conduct of all research involving human beings in accordance with the most current version of the Tri-Council Policy for the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans as the minimal standard. You may verify the ethical approval of this study, or to raise any concerns you might have, by contacting the Human Research Ethics Office at the University of Victoria 250 472 4545 or ethics@uvic.ca.

A copy of this consent form will be left with you. I will retain a second copy. You may contact Kevin Walby at 250 853 3783 (kwalby@uvic.ca) or Sean Hier at 250 853 3771 (shier@uvic.ca) if you have any questions or concerns.

Your signature below indicates that you understand the above conditions of participation in this study, and that you have had the opportunity to have your questions answered by the researcher.

Name of Participant

Signature

Date

A copy of this consent will be left with you, and a copy will be taken by the researcher.

Appendix 3

Interview Script – For City Representatives²²

Introduction

- Have the interviewee introduce themselves, their position and position within their organization.
- Can you talk about your own involvement with streetscape camera systems in the city?

Camera Background & Implementation Pre-Funding

- Can you describe your city's camera system for me? (Number of cameras, where located, when were they installed, what kind of cameras, what kind of monitoring). Who is responsible for and operates the system, who makes decisions on them?
- Can you go back to when cameras were first discussed as an option for the city? Who was involved, what were some of the reasons people were interested in them? Can you talk about what happened to the camera program after it was first mentioned (e.g. were cameras pursued, did discussion die down)?
- Was there any research undertaken on cameras at this stage, or did anyone visit other cities, speak to people in other cities?
- What was the reception to cameras like? Was everyone on board, any resistance? Did anyone raise concerns about cameras – if so, what?
- Were there any issues or challenges to implementing your city's camera system? What were some of these?
- Can you talk about the funding history of the cameras – e.g. funding discussions?
- Was there ever talk of the cameras being funded locally (e.g. by police, municipal government, BIAs, community organizations)? What happened? What were people saying?
- Once you had secured the provincial funding, did people's thoughts or attitudes change? Why and how?
- Did the implementation of your camera system change once you received the money?
 - Can you comment on the trajectory of your city's camera system – in particular I am interested in knowing whether and how the introduction of provincial funds might have sped up this process. Was this the case? How so?

²² This script was slightly amended for cities that were not successful in receiving grant funds. The questions about grant success were omitted, as were questions about operations if the city did not have an operational system (i.e. Peterborough). These participants were asked to reflect on their failed applications and what steps followed the notification that they had been unsuccessful.

Grant Programs

- How did you come to learn about the grant program(s)? Who first mentioned, what information was given? Why was this seen as something worth pursuing?
- How much was requested and how much did you receive? What did the funds pay for? Is there any money left?
- How important was it to have the provincial funding? Would cameras have been installed without them?
- Did the availability of funding enable or require you to do things differently than you would have otherwise done?
- How did people feel about cameras being funded with grant money?

On-going/Additional Funding

- Have any local funds gone toward the implementation or operation of the city's camera system?
- If future or on-going funding is needed for cameras, where will it come from?
- Does the city have plans to eventually install more cameras? Where would this be funded from (city, or apply for future grants)?

Application Process

Prior to and During Application

- Can you walk me through the process of applying for the funds – from when the initiative was announced to submitting the application? What happened, who and what was involved? For example:
 - what documents and information were made available to applicants?
 - what was the nature, if any, of communications between the ministry and the applicants – could applicants ask for help or clarification?
 - what was requested of applicants and how did you interpret these requests – did you have to shape or finesse your proposal to fit both your own goals but also the CR program's goals?
 - did applicants carry out research on cameras and how did you demonstrate this?
 - Who was involved in making the application? How were decisions made regarding the application and what were these decisions (e.g. how many cameras, where were cameras, what kind of monitoring system, rationale for)?
- Did the grant program(s) designate priority areas that they were willing to fund? What were they? How did your proposal for cameras fit into this?

- What was the nature of your involvement like with the Ministry throughout the application cycle?

After Awarded

- When were you informed you had been successful? What happened? What kinds of communication and information exchange took place? What happened after this?
- Have you stuck to the goals and uses of the funding as stated in your application or has this diverged at all in light of changing needs or concerns?
- What has your involvement with the Ministry been like since you received the money? Is there any reporting, monitoring or auditing you need to do? If so, at what intervals and to what extent? Any particular conditions on the funding?
- Did the grant program(s) and its requirements directly or indirectly influence or shape how the camera program was designed, implemented or used? If so, in what ways and how?
- Do you think the grant program(s) had an impact on the local crime and security agenda more generally?

Networking & Standardization

- Have you heard from or spoken to any other cities who have also applied for grant program(s) funds?
 - What was discussed and what information was shared?
 - Did you/they borrow any copies of past funding applications, research related to cameras, reports, governance documents?
 - How has this information been used?
- What are some of the sources of information which have been most instructive to helping you put together a proposal and application for the grant program(s)?
- What about sources of information that helped to design and implement your camera program? What did you use the most or what was most helpful?
- Did you consult with any federal or provincial guidelines concerning streetscape camera systems?
- Can you talk about your camera program in relation to existing privacy guidelines and best practices?
- Can you talk a bit about the kind of coordination or cooperation that went on between different agencies or organizations in bringing about this camera program?
- Can you talk a bit about who was involved in developing and designing the camera program and its policies?

Appendix 4

Interview Script – For Grant Program Representatives

Introduction

- Have the interviewee introduce themselves, their position and position within their organization.
- Have the interviewee briefly describe their grant program
- How much in funds is given each year? Approximately how many applications are received and how many are funded?
- Who is responsible for and makes any decisions about the program?

Program Design

- How much money is needed before a funding competition can be announced?
- Are there designated priority areas that the program funds (e.g. preventing youth crime?) If so – how are these decided, and by whom? If not – why not?
 - And - all things being equal, how are decisions made to fund particular initiatives over others? (e.g. prior funding precedent in either that city or that type of program)
- Are there “ideal” projects the program likes to fund? (for example, projects which have a low failure rate, projects that are relatively uncontroversial?); Any projects the program has or would shy away from?
 - Would you say that by funding a particular initiative implies endorsement of that approach?
- What information do you provide applicants with to assist them with creating a proposal?
- Can applicants contact program representatives for assistance with proposals? What is the extent of the help that can be given (e.g. generic clarification, concrete examples, etc)?
- Is there much room for idiosyncratic interpretation of the application requirements by the applicants – do you receive much variation in how applicants interpret the application criteria?

Evaluation and Decision-making Process

- Can you describe the process of evaluating proposals?
- Can you describe the criteria applicants must satisfy? Are these all weighted equally, or are some aspects more important than others? How do applicants demonstrate they have met the criteria sufficiently?
- What kind of evidence or research on the proposed initiative are applicants expected to provide? How comprehensive/extensive, pros/cons, scholarly/peer-reviewed/empirical?

- Do staff conduct any research on proposed initiatives, or do they vet any of the research presented by applicants? What kind of vetting is done for camera programs?
- Is there a requirement or expectation that applicants do background research on any legislation that may affect their initiative? Is there anyone at who assures compliance with relevant legislation?
- Are applications ranked against each other? How? (e.g. is there a point system?) – Who makes the final decision if there is a “tie”?
- What makes for a strong proposal?
- What would you say the main/common reasons are for a proposal not receiving funding?
- Are there any applications which evaluators decide the rationale or justification isn’t sufficient? Examples?

Post-funding

- What is the nature and extent of contact between the grant program and the cities once they have received funding?
- How is funding disbursed? How are applicants supposed to account for the money? Are there any conditions on spending the money?
- Are cities expected to report back? (On what aspects?) What are cities expected to produce or demonstrate? How is this information used by the grant program?

Camera Programs Specifically and their Funding

- Do you know how many camera programs have been funded through the grant program? (or how much in funding that has been given?)
- Are you seeing an increase in the number of applications who propose a camera program?
- Can you talk about any similarities or differences you have seen in the proposals for camera programs?
- Do you think the availability of funding for programs helps municipalities to establish a program they might not otherwise be able to fund themselves? How important do you think the availability of this funding is to local areas?
- How do you think the funding impacts municipal crime control agendas?
- How do you think applicants view the money?